

EXEGESIS UMBRAE - CUSTODIA GNOSIS -
PROJECT ANGELBOOK
- VOLUME XIII - PART 22 -

ALL NEW!

**+72
EVIL LEVELS!**

**#1
CHAOS
PLAYER!**

**+16 MEGA
WEAPONZ!**

**+68000
HELLBYTEZ**

**+4 DEMO
DISCZ**

PEGGO! DVTLS

**ONLY
£6⁷**

SC001 27 0435 111
9 144634 5061 11
© 2004 YES-TO BYEE



EZEKIEL REDIK YARBROUGH

Exegesis Umbrae –
Custodia Gnosis – Project
AngelBook – Volume XIII –
Part 22
By Ezekiel Redik Yarbrough
(DBM ECLIPZE)

Liminal Archivist's Note

On the Preservation of Distorted Gnosis and the Dying Digital Veil

There is a strange ache that comes from spending all day in the ruins of spiritual memory.

Fifty books made in one day—an inhuman output—should feel like a triumph. But when the source material is splintered, hostile, and drenched in egoic inversion, what remains is not pride... but hollowness.

This volume, like many in this phase, is not composed of my own words.

It is an act of preservation, not expression.

It is a documentation of liminal knowledge, scraped from a dying web—the final breath of spiritual forums, parapsychology ephemera, early occultist blogs, and yes, even the darker corridors of modern satanic movements.

And herein lies the tension:

Much of what is presented under the name Satanism is a distorted half-truth.

It correctly identifies that Yahweh is not the Most High, and in this way, it mirrors certain Gnostic insights—

but then it derails into ego exaltation, materialism, and psychic hostility. It gets halfway to freedom... and then builds a new prison out of flame and shadow.

And yet—

amidst the mockery, venom, and inversions,

there are real spiritual technologies embedded in the code.

Meditation techniques, psychic development maps, astral awareness, breath control, and ritual frameworks.

Not all of it is corrupted.

Some of it is usable tech.

Some of it may be ancient... wearing a new mask.

So I do not endorse what is preserved here.

But I also refuse to let it vanish into untraceable digital decay.

This is an act of containment as much as curation.

I name this phase liminal, because I know it will not last.

There is only so much of the old internet left to preserve.

Only so much unindexed gnosis hiding behind broken blog links and .org forums that haven't been cached since 2012.

When this phase ends, and I return to creation, I will draw from this tomb of fragments with clarity and discernment.

But for now, I am the one who stands in the gateway—

Archiving the bones, sealing the jars, lighting one gold-lettered candle above a chamber of shadows.

To the reader: proceed with awareness.

This is not scripture.

This is sediment.

It is archived because it is dangerous.

And dangerous knowledge, when preserved with respect, often becomes a mirror for deeper truth.

—Ezekiel Redik Yarbrough

Liminal Phase – Discretio Luminis

MachineChimera
Settling In

*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #17 on: July 10, 2006, 09:31:40 AM »

Quote

I have never seen him make the claim but if so, more power to the community.

rereads post by MachineChimera

eyes bulge and head explodes

Buffs nails and smirks. Yeah. I have that effect. Cheesy

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:45:46 AM by Crowley » Logged

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3199
Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #18 on: July 10, 2006, 01:18:54 PM »

Thread cleared, I'm taking it to PM to avoid clutter.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

MachineChimera
Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #19 on: July 10, 2006, 01:23:18 PM »

Ahhh. I see. Moderator jumps the gun and insults out of nowhere, the new guy. New guy defends himself. Moderator magically sweeps the evidence under the rug when it goes badly for him, and feigns to take the high road by labeling it an attempt to avoid clutter. Didn't know that's how things work hereabouts. ;o

Logged

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #20 on: July 10, 2006, 01:28:21 PM »

Now that's a personal attack, I could put it back if I wanted to, but you yourself requested that we stay on topic. At any rate the people who could make any decisions about my position as a moderator will be able to see the posts, as they remain in a place that staff can view. So no evidence has been magically deleted, simply moved to a place that people who don't need to read it, i.e., the general memberbase, can't. If you have any questions over the veracity of the 'Recycling Bin', the happy place where deleted posts go, you can ask any other member of the staff for a screenshot if you'd like.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm
« Reply #21 on: July 10, 2006, 01:36:03 PM »
nod Very well.

Logged
Forg
The V' Smithy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827
Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm
« Reply #22 on: July 10, 2006, 01:51:14 PM »
I do suppose we must get a few scientists so they can say what those here that are 'capable', are infact capable. Because, gosh darn it, what I've done and seen done seems an awful lot like proof to me. I'll make sure to take a few snapshots though next time for ya Smiley

Also to be noted: Where in the things that require belief such as the topic at hand, an experience of certain proofs on the level of that persons acceptance are necessary. No for you to say that something does or does not work you would need a level of evidence. I see claims...but my question to you is, have you tried any of it?

As far as the many concerned fields such as magick or psionics, there is a lot less to be found in terms of readily accessable proof, and much more to be found in simple denial and rejection. Kinda like the concept of the earth being the center of the solar system/. Before people were able to take a better look, it was crazy and stupid to think such things. But when they could finally see, there wasn't any more too it (give or take a few crazed maniacs in places of power).

Now where I can not directly present you a venue to see that is quick or easy, there still are ways. I suggest playing both sides of the field before you jump to these conclusions, if infact you are.

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 01:58:02 PM by Forg » Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Slinger

Settling In

*

Posts: 12

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #23 on: July 10, 2006, 02:58:39 PM »

1) Cool, that's my forum.

2) Hmm....didn't we already fix the name and banner? Apparently the link doesn't matter to much.

3) Wow..that debate with Machine might be contagiouse. If got restarted here...did it?

This debate may never end. Heh. Besides it's all so a good example opf all sorts of these psions vs. skepticism devates. Someone needs clear proof. Both sides, that is. This will be...for a while.

Logged

Vox Nocti

Frequent poster

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 256

Karma: 0

[Frequent poster](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #24 on: July 10, 2006, 03:33:36 PM »

If you want to take it up with me, take it to PM, don't post it in here for the same reasons I previously cleaned out the topic, because I will only feel compelled to do it again for the previously stated reasons.

- Faijer

edits the edit
ZOMG DONE!

~Vox

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 03:56:54 PM by Vox Nocti » Logged
"I'd like to apologize in advance for anything that I may say or do that could be construed as offensive as I slowly go NUTS." (Col. Jack 'O Neill, Stargate sg-1)

Ashrak: "And you are considered...well, a pain in the nikta"

'O Neill: "Neck?"

Teal'c: "No."

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #25 on: July 10, 2006, 05:19:02 PM »

Quote

"I do suppose we must get a few scientists so they can say what those here that are 'capable', are infact capable. Because, gosh darn it, what I've done and seen done seems an awful lot like proof to me. I'll make sure to take a few snapshots though next time for ya

Also to be noted: Where in the things that require belief such as the topic at hand, an experience of certain proofs on the level of that persons acceptance are necessary. No for you to say that something does or does not work you would need a level of evidence. I see claims...but my question to you is, have you tried any of it?

As far as the many concerned fields such as magick or psionics, there is a lot less to be found in terms of readily accessable proof, and much more to be found in simple denial and rejection. Kinda like the concept of the earth being the center of the solar system/. Before people were able to take a better look, it was crazy and stupid to think such things. But when they could finally see, there wasn't any more too it (give or take a few crazed maniacs in places of power).

Now where I can not directly present you a venue to see that is quick or easy, there still are ways. I suggest playing both sides of the field before you jump to these conclusions,

if infact you are. " -Forg

Of course it seems like proof to you; you're mentally predisposed to believe in it. Or are we to accept that everything someone THINKS They experience, see, or hear, actually IS what was there/what happened? So I suppose when people trip acid or do other drugs, and see the walls melting, or smurfs running around, it's actually true? OMG THERE ARE SMURFS AND MELTING WALLS?!?! Ah, no. So, it's common knowledge that, under the right conditions, a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough. Further argument for personal experiences? Just about EVERY Single religion that's ever existed has had people purporting to have personal experiences with gods, angels, devils, nature spirits, their ancestor spirits, animal/totem spirits.. you name it. So.. Then EVERY religion that's ever existed has been true, right? Quite a busy cosmological paradigm you must have, if that's the case. And if not, then it's awfully selective of you to decide which personal experiences of supposed paranormal activity were real and valid, and which aren't. YOu know what, I'm seeing a pattern here. Anecdotal accounts are the only 'evidence' of the phenomena, which defies all witnessing by credible skeptics, and evades all the best scientific minds and equipment. Hm. Alien abductions.. Loch Ness Monster, ghost hauntings, possession/demonic attack, magic(K)al powers, psychic abilities.. how strange. Also, I see another pattern! *gasp* Almost ALL of them miraculously fail to be witnesses or experienced by people with formal education and a 'healthy' upbringing. Why is it that none of this seems to be the case with people having degrees, for the most part? How strange!!

Have I tried any of it? Hm. Have you tried leaping off a building and flying like superman, Forg? Have you tried not eating food or drink for a year, to see if the need for nutrition is just a government propaganda? Have you tried to see if you could burn yourself, and absorb the power of fire by dowsing yourself in gasoline and then striking a match? What about stopping a speeding bus with your bare hands? .. No? W..what? I'm stunned. Wait. Why not? How do you know you can't do this stuff, if you don't try? You could REALLY be missing out! You could be flying around in the air, saving oodles of cash not wasted on life-sustaining food and beverage, shooting fire everywhere and flexing your super bus-stopping strength!! Oh. Yeah.. you know you can't do these things. Which is why you haven't. Hm. But I'm puzzled. You -KNOW- you can't do these things, but you haven't actually tried it? If someone pulls a gun on you and starts shooting, would you try to avoid being shot? But why? You don't KNOW until you try, if the bullets will just bounce off your chest? Hm. Again, I see that people argue "We have no proof, but you can't say it's not possible until you've tried it!".. and these are the very same people that function every day in every decision they make, making logical decisions based upon rational considerations of the subjects involved, and the rational assumption that what is true in one instance is true in every instance with the same variables. Hm. How exactly do you reconcile this strange duality of Logic and Illogic? "I'm rational in my everyday life, but for things I really like, I'm irrational." Children do that, you know. It's called "Playing Pretend." A child knows how things work, but enjoy pretending that things

aren't as they actually know they are. Yet another similar pattern of behavior. ;o

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection? Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics? People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

Ah.. also, I wouldn't go comparing the fallacy of 'occult' powers being real, to the ignorance of the earth being the center of the solar system. You're comparing a time when we are technologically advanced enough to see the furthest reaches of the galaxy, mathematically calculate how fast the universe is expanding, the temperatures of far off dwindling Stars based solely upon complicated physics and color patterns, and the ability to create mechanical semblances of LIFE.. to.. a time when people weren't even formally educated as a vast majority, and believed that dragons flew about, or that god was responsible for weather patterns. Well, I'd like to think we're far from that, but evidently some people still think supernatural powers are responsible for lightning or hail storms, and that dragons are still flying around. Doh. The difference between the two being that, when someone stepped forward and said "HEY, the earth is NOT the center of the solar system", he had the means to PROVE it. That's the nature of an assertion: if you're going to make a statement about the nature of reality, you'd better be able to verify it. I dare say, it was a harder time of proving the structure of the solar system and the earth's position in it, than for someone that can supposedly move things with their mind, or change ambient degrees, to do that around reputable witnesses. Also, the technology at the time was not sufficient predating that discovery, to actually learn the earth's place. The technology IS present to learn whether occult phenomena is real, and has been for some time: walk up to somebody that doesn't believe, and then prove it. Throw some lightning around? Oh wait, magic doesn't work ("that way." I think it was more correct as I worded it without parenthesis.). Why not levitate their shoes? Life some sheets of paper. Make it colder in the room. Produce some fire in your palm. No to any of those? Well. Pretty worthless 'powers', if you ask me, since they only seem to work when nobody's watching.

Rather, I'm not "Jumping to conclusions" about the non-existence of all these supposed powers, but making the rational, informed decision most other adults have: magic and psionics isn't real. It's a left-over, a relic from more ignorant times where people needed to believe in something more than the world around them, something more exciting or personally validating. Something comforting. "I'm special. I can do stuff other people can't." "I'm special, I'm not brainwashed by the conformist beliefs of society." "I know things will be okay, because God is watching over me, so everything happens for a reason." Stuff like that. Mental illusions that let people get by, that help them to cope.

See, if any of this crap could happen, SOMEONE that could do it, would prove it. Probably proves more. The fact that, once again.. NOBODY in the history of it's claim has ever stepped before a body of people not predisposed to it's belief and PROVEN such forces exist, is proof positive.

Edit: Added quote boxes for ease of reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:46:55 AM by Crowley » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #26 on: July 10, 2006, 05:37:00 PM »

I politely call MachineChimera's attention to the quote feature, simply because that would make his posts all the more legible Cheesy.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:19:02 PM

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection? Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics? People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

For what its worth, I'll note that I've never heard anyone (well, anyone decently reputable) claim to be able to actually create a "ball of glowing light." As for the rest of these spiffy effects in relation to laboratory tests... surprisingly enough, its not that simple. As it turns out, tests have been done where a bunch of scientists get together and, in a laboratory setting, watch some semi-famous psychic or mentalist do some amazing magical feat; the results were published, talked about, and so forth. However, these tests have very little impact because, predictably, they are by and large the result of stage magicians duping a bunch of innocent scientists. The key issue is

reproducible experiments (just like in the rest of science), and if some great and powerful, real psion shows up in a lab and does such-and-such amazing feats, it doesn't matter much because this can't be reproduced without that guy being around- so he can easily be written off as a trickster (extraordinary theories requiring extraordinary results, and all that). ...That's the long explanation, in either case. The shorter explanation is that if you go to a bunch of scientists and ask to have them watch you bend a spoon, they'll either laugh or back away nervously, and none of the few thousand-so people who probably could do such things reliably want to bother Cheesy.

All of which aside, of course, we're still waiting for Kobok to trot out his standard-issue references to the field of parapsychology, which has (through the use of random number generators and double-blind tests, and other clever things) produced truly reproducible experimental evidence for the existence of psi.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #27 on: July 10, 2006, 06:07:49 PM »

Quote

I politely call machinechimera's attention to the quote feature, simply because that would make his posts all the more legible .

Quote

Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 05:19:02 PM

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection?

Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics?

People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

For what its worth, I'll note that I've never heard anyone (well, anyone decently

reputable) claim to be able to actually create a "ball of glowing light." As for the rest of these spiffy effects in relation to laboratory tests... surprisingly enough, its not that simple. As it turns out, tests have been done where a bunch of scientists get together and, in a laboratory setting, watch some semi-famous psychic or mentalist do some amazing magical feat; the results were published, talked about, and so forth. However, these tests have very little impact because, predictably, they are by and large the result of stage magicians duping a bunch of innocent scientists. The key issue is reproducible experiments (just like in the rest of science), and if some great and powerful, real psion shows up in a lab and does such-and-such amazing feats, it doesn't matter much because this can't be reproduced without that guy being around- so he can easily be written off as a trickster (extraordinary theories requiring extraordinary results, and all that). ...Thats the long explanation, in either case. The shorter explanation is that if you go to a bunch of scientists and ask to have them watch you bend a spoon, they'll either laugh or back away nervously, and none of the few thousand-so people who probably could do such things reliably want to bother .

All of which aside, of course, we're still waiting for Kobok to trot out his standard-issue references to the field of parapsychology, which has (through the use of random number generators and double-blind tests, and other clever things) produced truly reproducible experimental evidence for the existence of psi. - Zake

Heh.. I'd love to see those standard issue references, m'self. *grin*

But the instance you mentioned IS reproducible: nobody else even has to be able to do it, so long as that great and powerful Psion can do it. If he can move things with his mind repeatedly, before anybody that states otherwise, he's pretty much proven it. They might not be able to explain it or say it's a world wide phenomena, but they can at least verify that Yes, -that- man has that ability. That would be "proof." That's what frustrates me so much, in part, honestly: people run around talking about this stuff like it's real. Like someone actually has ever been able to do that. Nobody, ever, has been able to man up to the claim in that fashion. That's proof all it's own that, either the people that claim they can do it aren't so sure they can, or that they know it's outright crap, on some level, and don't want to have to prove it to themselves by having other people point out how they can't do it in person. Mf. And I doubt it's a matter of 'don't want to bother.' I mean, the male psychology, for instance. When I put up 245 on bench press, I was proud as hell. I ran around telling -everybody- I hung out with. I was eager to show them. It was something to be proud of.. something not everybody can do, dig? You score 1300+ on SAT's, you tell people. You show them the paper to prove it. Same with an award. Place big in a national martial arts competition, you keep the trophy. So you can show people. Hell, kids flip their lids talking trash and eager to demonstrate just the ability to kick someone else's ass in a certain video game, or bragging about a code or combination they know. If people could actually manipulate the weather by some occult power, or move things with their mind, etc, etc, I gaurandamnTee you there'd be people coming out of the wordwork eager to show people what they could do, get that extra, special attention and fame, the money, etc.

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading. ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:48:26 AM by Crowley » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #28 on: July 10, 2006, 07:44:35 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 06:07:49 PM

That's what frustrates me so much, in part, honestly: people run around talking about this stuff like it's real. Like someone actually has ever been able to do that. Nobody, ever, has been able to man up to the claim in that fashion. That's proof all it's own that, either the people that claim they can do it aren't so sure they can, or that they know it's outright crap, on some level, and don't want to have to prove it to themselves by having other people point out how they can't do it in person. Mf.

And thats what frusterates me so much, that people assume that their own more-or-less arbitrary definiton of what would happen if it were real infallibly reflects what is actually true. It is sort of strange, yah, that no one has had the chutzpah to go up to the developed, media-connected world and get some inexplicable power validated- however, strange doesn't mean impossible, so give us a break. One could come up with all manner of credible reasons why they wouldn't have. For the first example- could the great and powerful psion overturn the entirety of scientific thought that doesn't allow for psi? Even if sufficient scientists were willing to undertake what would be inconvenient and extremely dubious experiments, most "consistent" psionic abilities (telepathy, for example) are such that they could be faked by a sufficiently skilled trickster, and therefore the entire series of experiments involving this person could be dismissed. As for not bothering... well, in our society we can be pretty sure that humongous bench presses and lofty SAT scores can get us some high praise and nice opportunities, but thats far different from proving psi. The thought of being the "OMG PS!!!" psion who gets tested by legions of scientists and on some of the most controversial headlines of the decade would be so daunting you can't blame those few powerful psions from backing away from the notion (especially if they've seen the X-men movies Cheesy). The arguement of "but someone would have done it" doesn't really apply when there are so few psions (or magicians, or whatever) skilled enough to produce the right effects reliably.

This is an issue that has come up pretty often around here, and the general opinion has been that the likelihood that the nonexistence of mainstream "proof" invalidates psi is less than the likelihood that all the other evidence we have ourselves experienced validates it (that's why we're all here, obviously).

As for those standard issue references, you may notice that my mention of it up there was a link to the appropriate veritas wiki page. Some of those links should lead to useful sources on the topic.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #29 on: July 10, 2006, 09:38:53 PM »

Can't prove it, hmm, I'm pretty sure I can prove it actually. Don't recall saying that I couldn't. I also don't recall being told by any scientists I couldn't either. But I'm glad to see you won't because it's so above you as you 'know for a fact' that it's untrue.

Now I agree with you to the point where it's quite easy to delude oneself to a degree where you believe what is in fact 'untrue' but remains true to you as one builds his or her reality. And I could very well be deluded to this point. But it has been to a degree where I can cause an effect on others' reality by simply showing them *gasp*

But in this era of immense technology, a science where there couldn't possibly be anything else to prove, I won't. I'm not Jesus and I really don't care if you believe in this or not, but it is pretty fun to watch you try and save the masses of those suffering children who do believe. A noble goal, you should spread the word. Stop us before we fly away off the bridge, because I can, wanna see?

(if it really concerns you all too much, I have a shitty psiwheel video you can disprove if you'd like to see it, PM me)

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 09:40:27 PM by Forg » Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred

book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.30.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 24 Apr 2013

Jul APR May

24

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 24, 2013, 03:24:33 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207176 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18392 Members - Latest Member: - Nikko Most
online today: 94 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «

previous next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15027 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4737

Karma: 145

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #30 on: July 10, 2006, 11:52:44 PM »

Quote from: solstice on July 10, 2006, 08:29:16 AM

Hey, Kobot, aint you a reputable scientist? <G>

Heheh. Well, they keep giving me a paycheck, so at least somebody thinks so.
Smiley

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

First off, let me start with a greeting to all present, since I'm the new guy.

Welcome. I hope you enjoy the discussion here. Smiley

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

Metaphysics, like all branches of Philosophy, is entirely a soft science. Consider the definition "Soft science is a colloquial term, often used pejoratively, for academic research or scholarship which is purportedly "scientific" while its adherence to or rigor of scientific method is considered to be soft, not based on reproducible experimental data and/or a mathematical explanation of that data."

By nature, you cannot "demand proof" for any soft science, since they are by and large matters for which data is considered qualitative, instead've quantitatively. The "proof" I have demanded is qualitative proof.. evidence in demonstration and application of use. I have not demanded that someone should point out the energy behind the supposed forces in question, or their laws of operation, or so on, so much as demanded that someone make reliable, demonstrative use of it before entities capable of reliably qualifying it as valid.

(It's difficult to tell which parts are your writing, but I will do my best. If you use the "Insert Quote" link in the posts beneath the edit window, it will be easier to distinguish your writing from that of the people you are referring to.)

I think if we're going to argue definitions, we should be careful. First, we must sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and

"metaphysical" that are in active use across the English speaking world. First, there is metaphysics the classical philosophy. Second, there are the metaphysical arts studied here, such as psi, chi, magick, etc. These two definitions have about as much in common as physics and physical activity. I would be a bit of a moron if I were to claim that gym teachers don't know what they're talking about because they call it physical education but don't teach physics.

So let's simply accept that there are two distinct uses, one of which is a classical philosophy (not of interest in this discussion), and one of which involves an art, practice, path, trade, or skill.

There is a completely SEPARATE word for the science involving the metaphysical arts, and that science is called "parapsychology". While the metaphysical arts are more concerned with the practical application of the field of interest, parapsychology is more interested in the rigorous and scientific study and investigation of the properties of this area.

It would not be fair to expect the metaphysical arts to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice (just as you would not expect sports players to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice). It would also not be fair to expect each of the results of parapsychology to be directly applied to everyday life, as this is not the primary focus of parapsychology.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

Mostly correct in so much as the overall tone of the disagreement, save that you have erred on the point of assumptive ignorance, in the same fashion as Darknen did. I've studied occultism in myriad forms from likely the same sources most of you have, I should think, which traditionally comes in written format. Also, my point is not 'no reputable scientist believe it', so much as the reason why no reputable scientist believes in such; a lack of logical reason to do so.

Well, if we're going to discuss reason and science, let's do it right. When I'm investigating a new scientific area, the first thing I do is usually a literature search. If you try to form an opinion without first turning to the authoritative textbooks or journal articles in a subject, then it is quite likely your opinion will be quite pseudoscientific in its nature, even if it sounds "reasonable" to your everyday instincts.

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?

Quote from: MachineChimera

Let a renown mathematician make the same claim, and I can guarantee he'll get coverage and inquiry.

Mathematician, eh? How about a fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and

author of four statistics textbooks named Jessica Utts? (please click that link) Oh, and coincidentally, the author who takes the mere secondary position on that paper is Brian Josephson, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, and inventor of the Josephson junction.

Quote from: MachineChimera

So, it's common knowledge that, under the right conditions, a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough.

Now on this you and I definitely agree. Smiley But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others?

Quote from: MachineChimera

... And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up?

Been there, done that, didn't like the resulting publicity and reactions of others. The reactions of others include astonishment, incredulity, fear, withdrawal, and a number of similar emotional effects. And then of course, those who witness it tell others, and soon everyone wants a demonstration, up until the point you say no, and then the ones you say no to don't believe you, while some of the ones you demonstrate it for try to find ways to wipe it out of their mind or explain it away in any method that will let them return to their previous comfortable beliefs.

So as a personal rule, I don't "do" demonstrations anymore. Since after all, what's the point when, like you said, "a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough."

So the argument is best made in a more gentle fashion, by the calm and careful pointing to a massive body of scientific evidence with which you would do well to familiarize yourself.

Zake already provided you with a link to an excellent starting point. And the best place to start is to read the book mentioned there, *The Conscious Universe*, by psychologist Dean Radin. It contains a fairly lengthy set of references (also available from a link on that page without actually reading the book, but the book is definitely worth reading). Those references would provide a solid launching point for any serious perusal of the scientific literature on this subject.

Logged
MachineChimera
Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #31 on: July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM »

Quote

"Welcome. I hope you enjoy the discussion here. "

Thank you. I have thusfar, and expect I shall continue to do so, with any luck. ;d

Quote

"I think if we're going to argue definitions, we should be careful. First, we must sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" that are in active use across the English speaking world. First, there is metaphysics the classical philosophy. Second, there are the metaphysical arts studied here, such as psi, chi, magick, etc. These two definitions have about as much in common as physics and physical activity. I would be a bit of a moron if I were to claim that gym teachers don't know what they're talking about because they call it physical education but don't teach physics.

So let's simply accept that there are two distinct uses, one of which is a classical philosophy (not of interest in this discussion), and one of which involves an art, practice, path, trade, or skill."

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two seperate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.

Quote

"There is a completely SEPARATE word for the science involving the metaphysical arts, and that science is called "parapsychology". While the metaphysical arts are more concerned with the practical application of the field of interest, parapsychology is more interested in the rigorous and scientific study and investigation of the properties of this area."

Again, I will raise the point that what you are discussing here are not 'metaphysical arts', but rather paranormal, or parapsychological. I'm well familiar with both terms, though

you seem to talk about it in a fashion indicative of a failing on my part in that regard. Pedagoguesque tone aside, I'm sure you intended well in doing so. I'll address that assumption later in this response, however. Parapsychology is interested in the actual investigation and validation of such claims and possibilities as are mentioned here. What you call "metaphysical arts" is nothing more, and no different than, the same wand-waving, crystal chanting, circle drawing, sigil and power-word invocation that has survived under the same generic principles and individual methodologies since the dark ages, at the least.

Quote

"It would not be fair to expect the metaphysical arts to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice (just as you would not expect sports players to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice). It would also not be fair to expect each of the results of parapsychology to be directly applied to everyday life, as this is not the primary focus of parapsychology."

It would indeed be fair, if they truly were at all a study as to the veracity and truth of what was being discussed, much less their "applications". It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

Quote

"Well, if we're going to discuss reason and science, let's do it right. When I'm investigating a new scientific area, the first thing I do is usually a literature search. If you try to form an opinion without first turning to the authoritative textbooks or journal articles in a subject, then it is quite likely your opinion will be quite pseudoscientific in its nature, even if it sounds "reasonable" to your everyday instincts.

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?"

We entirely agree upon the principle of error in forming an idea without basis upon which to form valid idea/opinion. I spoke earlier as to the error of your assumption, and the tone in which you are asserting it both previously, and again, here, and will address such now. Perhaps just over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles relating to the subject(s). I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years. So, if you seek to insinuate that I'm criticizing something I've no factual knowledge about, you insinuate in error.

Quote

"Mathematician, eh? How about a fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and

author of four statistics textbooks named Jessica Utts? (please click that link) Oh, and coincidentally, the author who takes the mere secondary position on that paper is Brian Josephson, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, and inventor of the Josephson junction."

Mm, statistics. We have here information published on the nature of telepathic, clairvoyant, and perhaps precognitive investigations done both by the government and by civilian counterparts. I will start by stating that you note all of these tests discuss 'evidence' (not proof) of the above abilities, and that even your "fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks" along with the follow-on winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, offer only that even if such abilities as above mentioned exist, they perhaps only serve to increase the chance of knowing such things to a degree that might not even be statistically noteworthy or valid without an extended number of attempts. This assertion itself, they field on a fair number of possibilities and "if's." Further, you will note that is TWO supports in a community FULL of vastly more accomplished skeptics and more educated beings, as well as the overwhelming majority of other Noble Prize winners, who would disagree and do not share their findings. Also, I'll note that they do not open the floor to critical review and assessment of their findings and assertions by their peers in the scientific community; they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low. They attempt to spin that by claiming that the talent might be an assistance factor, not an actual power that's always on. The words she used were "1/3 instead've 1/4th" for example?

Ironically, she is a credible statistician, with a credible scientific backer, that accounts for an infinitesimally small portion of a percent of community that by and large, disagrees with her entirely. Cheesy

Quote

"Now on this you and I definitely agree. But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others"

I have, and was waiting for someone to take this direction. I'm pleased I didn't have to wait long. That principle affects all of us to mutual degree. The difference is that I am forming rational assertions and using the tools of logic and rational thought to pursue my viewpoint, and thereby have some modicum of buffer to natural, emotional discolorations of opinion, whereas those supporting this paranormal bunkery are not. I will demonstrate several of those courses of logic, by which, even without independant study upon the subject at hand, one might easily arrive upon the rational belief that psychic abilities and magic are fallacies. A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existance, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of

the above. B) If a thing exists, it exists always, unless some greater force acts in cancellation/destruction. If someone has a talent, that talent is always present. Someone that can play chess very well, can always play chess very well. It doesn't come and go with concentration or skeptic watchers. A talented basketball player is always a talented basketball player, in so far as the talent goes, outside of exterior detrimental effects like age, injury, drugs, etc. Even on an "off" day, he or she is better than the average player, and the talent even on an off day is noticable. C) Real things that are fantastical and sensational, are generally well known. Many people know about the baby in Germany that's 'super strong' due to a strange birth defect that left him without the genes that account for the atrophy of unused muscle. World records, like the fastest running man, the strongest lifting, etc, are well documented. If such fantastical, sensational powers like the ability to lift or move objects with the mind really existed, they'd be well documented as fact, and well known. There'd be names in world record books, as to who could move the most mentally, or who's the most accurate precognitive, etc, etc.

Quote

"Been there, done that, didn't like the resulting publicity and reactions of others. The reactions of others include astonishment, incredulity, fear, withdrawal, and a number of similar emotional effects. And then of course, those who witness it tell others, and soon everyone wants a demonstration, up until the point you say no, and then the ones you say no to don't believe you, while some of the ones you demonstrate it for try to find ways to wipe it out of their mind or explain it away in any method that will let them return to their previous comfortable beliefs."

Of-course- you did. Praytell, what "publicity" did you get? Where was the account published or televised? And who did you "perform" these mindboggling feats before, I wonder? Stage magicians often induce the same reactions you describe. I suppose that makes their "magic" real, too, mm? What you describe is the general course for talented people like gifted intellectuals doing rubix-cube puzzles, or athletes that sprint or lift very well. Yet they don't go into hiding to avoid the attention. I suppose the difference is they can actually prove they can do what they do. Or perhaps the "metaphysical" (as the term is used here) nature of your arts makes it the exception: gifted practitioners avoid attention, all while making public discussion of it on the internet. Yet another 'exception' to the rule of comparable situations. And yet another logical reason to write off such fantastical claims: when a large number of exceptions to standard rules pile up around something, it's usually bogus. The most common example of such a pattern would be a hard to believe lie. Sure, it could be true, but people disbelieve it, except for the gullible, because of such a pattern. "Your.. aunt is going to die, and you need to be there for her... on the Friday you've been trying to get off work for the past month now? We can't call the doctor because he doesn't have a phone, though? He wrote you by mail to let you know? ... But you can't show us the letter he wrote you to inform you, because your dog ate it?" Indeed. Also, you use words that seem to be of the mein of painting people that don't operate under your viewpoint of the possible and rational as sheepish retreatists, trying to purge from their mind concepts they can't understand or don't want to remember... as though witnessing

such a thing is somehow traumatic. I'll note that firstly, none of the government or civilian enterprises studying this sort've thing, experience such a traumatic response to protect the psyche by explaining it out of thought. Secondly, that would not be the response most would have. If people had demonstrated to them such a feat of magickal or psychic power.. of any supernatural effect, honestly, they'd be clamoring to learn it themselves, not regressing from it. Who wouldn't want such an ability? I suspect the desire to have such power and be that special is foremost on most of the minds of individuals that get into this sort've thing in the first place, regardless of whatever higher, universally altruistic nobilities of desire to improve the self you might contrive. People envy power and abilities, they're not traumatized by them, so that description is both inaccurate and entirely not in following with the human behavior, quite frankly. I'm forced to wonder why you'd assume such a thing was the reason they'd explain it away, in fact.. as again, when a person makes an assumption, it's strongly colored by their own perspectives. Such would indicate that you.. feel superior to people that don't believe in such nonsense, and believe that you have a more 'open' mind, and are able to 'grasp' concepts that would disturb 'mundane' people. Interesting.

Quote

"So the argument is best made in a more gentle fashion, by the calm and careful pointing to a massive body of scientific evidence with which you would do well to familiarize yourself.

Quote

Zake already provided you with a link to an excellent starting point. And the best place to start is to read the book mentioned there, *The Conscious Universe*, by psychologist Dean Radin. It contains a fairly lengthy set of references (also available from a link on that page without actually reading the book, but the book is definitely worth reading). Those references would provide a solid launching point for any serious perusal of the scientific literature on this subject."

Annnnd once again you condescend in error. *Wry grin.* You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored. Since you seem fond of pointing to supporting links, shall I begin giving you links for a good place to start along the rational, logical approach to reality and critical thinking, by linking the NUMEROUS, overwhelming scientific resources that debunk psychic and magical claims, or skeptical sites that would further educate you as to the mysteries of the error of thinking involved in harboring such a belief system? I can only, as you have, make the assumption that you have not made a study of rational thought and logical thinking. Shall I point you in that direction as well? Grin

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 07:27:37 AM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Mobius

Veritas Council
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 324
Karma: 25

Fundamental Psi Coordinator

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #32 on: July 11, 2006, 07:50:57 AM »

Quote from: Machine Chimera

I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years.

I am curious, where, what, and possibly under who did you study?

Logged

Deus Ex Vir

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #33 on: July 11, 2006, 08:01:30 AM »

Quote from: `Gemini on July 11, 2006, 07:50:57 AM

Quote from: Machine Chimera

I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years.

I am curious, where, what, and possibly under who did you study?

Various texts drawn from libraries, and internet resources secondarily. I was a heavy book worm in my early teen years, and bounced around a lot thanks to a military family.

I read all manner of paranormal/occult literature at the time... I thought the ideas of magick and psychic powers were fascinating, and even went so far as to read into angelic thrones and demonology, aside from regular theological readings. Meh. I also read heavily into ghosts and "hauntings", and additionally in a somewhat related note, branched into philosophy, at which point I began honing a more logical edge. I'm especially fond of human behavioral philosophies, ethics, and theoretical physics.

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 08:11:11 AM by MachineChimera » Logged

Big Boss
Friggen Crazy
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #34 on: July 11, 2006, 08:22:05 AM »

Quote

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two seperate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.

just on a sidenote of word definition. Words can mean whatever you want them to mean, just like "gay" used to mean happy and now means offensive and homosexual (two definitions) and "sweet" used to mean... well, sweet. now it can mean sweet, exciting, awesome etc.

Richard Dawkins wrote in his book "The Selfish Gene" that, "Human suffering has been caused because too many of us cannot grasp that words are only tools for our use, and that the mere presence in the dictionary of a word like 'living' does not mean it necessarily has to refer to something definite in the real world."

This word thing makes a fair analogy to parapsychology as well. The words surrounding it don't make it exist (or not exist). They simply try to make us understand logically something society has told us for years is "impossible."

Quote

It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

Unproven theories huh? There are lots of unproven theories in the scientific world. In fact, the scientific world doesn't try to prove anything. they try to disprove. In my Advanced physical science class (fancy title for physics) I learned that a theory only exists when there is nothing to disprove it. Nothing in the scientific world has been proven. You really can't "prove" anything, you can only come up with a substantial amount of evidence surrounding it to convince the masses that it is "true" which, I learned on my first day in philosophy 1000, that you also cannot prove "truth" because truth is a word that implies a belief based on your perception of "reality."

Quote

Then you say "you were a bit biased, understandably because the scientific evidence strongly supports your theory"

Well, in general, we get three choices:

1. Choosing our opinions in favor of the evidence.
2. Drawing no conclusion.
3. Most likely being wrong.

The stronger the evidence gets, the wiser it is to choose category #1. In addition, when there IS evidence supporting the conclusion drawn, and when the existing evidence primarily, strongly, or exclusively supports one conclusion, then it certainly doesn't fit the standard definition of "bias", as it is neither "unfair" nor "prejudice" to draw a conclusion from the evidence.

Can you present any evidence for a distance dependence of psi which cannot already be explained by modulation due to expectations?

This quote is by Kobok in an earlier debate I had with him. The subject matter is moot for this particular discussion, but he makes a valid point in number 1. Our beliefs in psionics or metaphysics or tacos or gravity even are really just opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to the subject. (I'd also like to add that as of now in the scientific community, there is no explanation for the existence of gravity. We can measure it, and we can predict its movements, much like a somewhat well established telepath can predict the aciton of metaphysical energy. but in both instances, we don't know exactly what it is that makes them work.

Quote

A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above.
there is your example. Gravity is not tangible, but it affects physical matter, and radial matter, such as light waves.)

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #35 on: July 11, 2006, 08:44:17 AM »

Quote

just on a sidenote of word definition. Words can mean whatever you want them to mean, just like "gay" used to mean happy and now means offensive and homosexual (two definitions) and "sweet" used to mean... well, sweet. now it can mean sweet, exciting, awesome etc.

Richard Dawkins wrote in his book "The Selfish Gene" that, "Human suffering has been caused because too many of us cannot grasp that words are only tools for our use, and that the mere presence in the dictionary of a word like 'living' does not mean it necessarily has to refer to something definite in the real world."

This word thing makes a fair analogy to parapsychology as well. The words surrounding it don't make it exist (or not exist). They simply try to make us understand logically something society has told us for years is "impossible."

Technically correct, just as it is technically correct to say that, as language and words are a tool for communication, and valid only in that regard alone, a tool is not valid for communication unless everyone has the same grasp or understanding of the tool. A word, like a symbol, a flare, or any other signal, is not an effective tool and is indeed worthless, if the people that are going to use it do not have a common understanding of what exactly that signal is to equate to. Which is why a word holds a certain meaning to the general populous. If a very small group uses a word to mean something

different, for which there are already other meaningful 'signals'/words, they are not only needlessly avoiding the already existant words more properly 'meaningful' in that equation, but are going to also needlessly confuse others outside their grouping. Such confusion is against the specific intent of a word having common meaning in the first place: to avoid confusion and save time of explanation by having a common grounds understanding of interpretation.

Quote

Unproven theories huh? There are lots of unproven theories in the scientific world. In fact, the scientific world doesn't try to prove anything. they try to disprove. In my Advanced physical science class (fancy title for physics) I learned that a theory only exists when there is nothing to disprove it. Nothing in the scientific world has been proven. You really can't "prove" anything, you can only come up with a substantial amount of evidence surrounding it to convince the masses that it is "true" which, I learned on my first day in philosophy 1000, that you also cannot prove "truth" because truth is a word that implies a belief based on your perception of "reality."

Yes, that is the definition of a Theory: Something that can neither be proven or disproven. Theories however, are considered valid or not, in the absentia of ability to prove them, by supporting evidence, such as when associative mathematical formula taking into account a theoretical value, work out correctly and are seen to be applicable, indicative of a degree of veracity in measure to the observable results dependant upon theoretical value's inclusion. That is what seperates all theories from being equally valid or not, and why some Theories are as useful as facts, nearly, while others are worthless concoctions. Also, while nothing can be -actually- proven, as Thomas Hume already asserted, society and all it's individuals cannot function without the assumption that some things -are- proven/facts "within reasonable doubt." Things cannot be proven, but things can be proven "within reasonable doubt." Such is the foundation for necessary assumptions, without which you could not formulate courses of action with any degree of efficiency, or a modicum of development, as advancement is based upon moving past what is already discovered or used, and you could not advance anything without the assumption that a thing will function, under a certain set of variables, consistantly. We operate under this capacity every day; for example, you do not treat your computer as though it were a nuclear bomb that would go off if you touch the keyboard. You assume that it is, in fact, a computer, and that computers do not behave this way in general, and further that if you use the computer in meaningful ways that have functioned before, i.e. keystrokes, that the characters will be produced upon screen in such a fashion, and sent thus, instead've having to experiment with every key on your keyboard to figure out which key produces which. Which would, itself, be useless, since such an experiment would rely upon the assumption that the keystrokes' values didn't change between the time you first struck them, and the next application meant to produce intended character. So, while you can invalidate any argument by stating that nothing can be proven, as has been done ad nauseam, such holds nothing of value in the context of just about any discussion, and if truly adhered to, would generate nothing of value, ever. It's something that's spoken of in factual context, but never used in actual, pragmatic existance.

Quote

This quote is by Kobok in an earlier debate I had with him. The subject matter is moot for this particular discussion, but he makes a valid point in number 1. Our beliefs in psionics or metaphysics or tacos or gravity even are really just opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to the subject. (I'd also like to add that as of now in the scientific community, there is no explanation for the existence of gravity. We can measure it, and we can predict its movements, much like a somewhat well established telepath can predict the action of metaphysical energy. but in both instances, we don't know exactly what it is that makes them work.

Quote

A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above.
there is your example. Gravity is not tangible, but it affects physical matter, and radial matter, such as light waves.)

Indeed, our opinions of such are opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to a subject. That is because, within the realm of a rational being and reasonable doubt's limits, evidence is useful to formulating decisions and courses of action. So the greater the body of evidence in support of an idea, the more valuable the idea becomes in regard to a rational being's decision-making process, in consideration of the subject and all things in relation to the subject itself. As to gravity, you have not evidently familiarized yourself with the gravitational theories of Stephen Hawking; gravity is, to the best of present scientific theory's consideration, a PHYSICAL force, resultant upon the body of a mass depressing the space around it as it occupies it, as if you were placing a rock onto a sheet of paper. If you have a blanket stretched taut for example, and put a few items around the center, and then put a heavy object into the center of the blanket, it would -pull- the surrounding items toward that center of depression, as the fabric is being pulled in that direction. You can read his work directly for a much more technical evaluation, and I'm sure you'll find he puts it in better analogy than I do, but do definitely read up on his theories about gravitational force. As it stands however, the scientific community, as Mr. Hawking, categorize gravity as a PHYSICAL force, the results of a physical mass taking up space within the fabric of space itself.

Logged
Big Boss
Friggen Crazy
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1458
Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #36 on: July 11, 2006, 09:01:53 AM »

Quote

So, while you can invalidate any argument by stating that nothing can be proven, as has been done ad nauseam, such holds nothing of value in the context of just about any discussion, and if truly adhered to, would generate nothing of value, ever. It's something that's spoken of in factual context, but never used in actual, pragmatic existence.

Just as I can invalidate anything you can say with that (and gaining nothing, I understand) you can do the same with the opposite. You can evidently give us evidence (which I haven't seen yet. please produce. We did our part in coming up with references and links to provide evidence to our cause, it's only fair that you put in the same amount of effort.) to "prove" we are wrong, and we can give evidence to "prove" the opposite. I think we both know, and maybe we both refuse to acknowledge, that this whole debate will boil down to, "Nuh uh!" and "Uh huh!" "I'm right," "No! I'm right." It really comes down to personal belief. I believe that we all need something to believe in, even if that something is nothing.

I'm actually pretty interested in hearing what your fellow skeptics have to say. I hypothesize that the behavior will be similar in that when we say, "Thank God I away from traditional materialistic belief. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by conventional societal means." Sounds familiar to, "Thank God I got away from the occult. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by those false beliefs."

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #37 on: July 11, 2006, 09:43:56 AM »

I am interested in the number degrees he has, which quantifies his assertions that no scientific evidence exists on this subject *cough*

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #38 on: July 11, 2006, 10:32:51 AM »

Quote

"Just as I can invalidate anything you can say with that (and gaining nothing, I understand) you can do the same with the opposite. You can evidently give us evidence (which I haven't seen yet. please produce. We did our part in coming up with references and links to provide evidence to our cause, it's only fair that you put in the same amount of effort.) to "prove" we are wrong, and we can give evidence to "prove" the opposite. I think we both know, and maybe we both refuse to acknowledge, that this whole debate will boil down to, "Nuh uh!" and "Uh huh!" "I'm right," "No! I'm right." It really comes down to personal belief. I believe that we all need something to believe in, even if that something is nothing.

I'm actually pretty interested in hearing what your fellow skeptics have to say. I hypothesize that the behavior will be similar in that when we say, "Thank God I away from traditional materialistic belief. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by conventional societal means." Sounds familiar to, "Thank God I got away from the occult. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by those false beliefs." - Martial Thoughts"

As to evidence, generally the individual making a claim bears the burden of proof. You do not prove something doesn't exist, because you cannot.. it can always be argued that you simply haven't found it. Rather, something must be proven to exist (and again,

we will use the word proof in the meaningful sense that is most commonly found in its use.. Beyond all reasonable doubt.), when it is claimed to have been found or achieved. Notwithstanding, I've several resources gladly provided in that regard, detailing all manner of statistical evidences against "successful" psychic tests, clairvoyant readings, and a vast number of hoaxes and alledged claims, which seems to be the normal for this sort've matter. Always anecdotal stories, all talk, and no actual demonstration.

Books: The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a candle in the Dark, by Carl Sagan. I am Therefore I Think: A Skeptical Manifesto, by Michael Shermer. Truth, Knowledge, Or Just Plain Bull: How To Tell The Difference: A Handbook of Practical Logic and Clear Thinking, by Bernard Patten. Skeptical Odysseys: Personal Accounts by the World's Leading Paranormal Inquirers, as edited by Paul Kurtz. Pseudoscience and the Paranormal, 2nd edition, by Terence Hines. Secrets of the Psychics: Investigating Paranormal Claims, by Massimo Polidoro. The Psychology of the Psychic, by David Marks.

Also, the following weblinks are quite handy.

<http://www.skeptic.com/>

-<http://www.randi.org/> (You'll note he offered \$10,000 initially to ANYONE that could demonstrate actual psychic, supernatural, or paranormal powers. At present, the challenge amount is in excess of \$700,000.)

<http://www.csicop.org>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9511/eyewitness.html>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9603/claims.html>

<http://atheism.about.com/od/skepticismnews/>

<http://www.ntskeptics.org/>

Quote

"I am interested in the number degrees he has, which quantifies his assertions that no scientific evidence exists on this subject *cough*" -Solstice

I'm interested in the number of degrees you have, which qualifies your assertions of opinions regarding your various spookeries and psychic/magic thread submissions. *Cough.* Also, I'm interested in the number of years you've been speaking english, since you have repeated problems with spelling and grammar. Ooh, and as a side note, I'm interested as to what degree you have regarding understanding of words central to your hobbies, since you didn't actually know what the word metaphysics means, and sought to, laughably, accuse me before I joined this thread of not understanding the word's meaning myself. Perhaps you have a degree in Irony? Or is it in Hypocrisy, since you commented just a few back before it was removed by a mod that personal attacks should be avoided, and that we should all act like adults, whether we were or not.

Anything else tickling your throat, or are you done coughing now? *smirk.*

Logged
solstice

Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #39 on: July 11, 2006, 10:38:16 AM »

Answer the question, wise ass.

Now, we stoop to who speaks English better? Did you not agree to keep all the silliness out of this thread when a moderator spoke to you</rhetorical question>

Metaphysical (adj.)

2: Transcending physical matter.

Source: Oxford English Dictionary

Now, I am no scholar, but is Oxford not one of them fancy rich people schools, for learnin' and stuff?

In answer to your actual question: I would have to concede that your perception is correct, and that I practise "spookery" Since I do not adhere to your false pretence, there is no way to give you a truthful response. There is no magick/psychic forum here, so you may have to be more specific in the future.

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 11:12:58 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4737
Karma: 145

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #40 on: July 11, 2006, 12:49:17 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.

Because "paranormal" includes all sorts of topics such as ghosts, and sasquatches, and little monsters swimming in British lakes, and ufos, and so forth. These topics are well outside of our common interests, and have nothing to do with the metaphysical arts.

Calling it an obscurity of this community is a significant misassessment. You need do little more investigation than googling the word "metaphysics", and noting that the first link is a wiki article which discusses the philosophy, and the second link is this article titled "Metaphysics: Multiple Meanings":

<http://www.websyte.com/alan/metamul.htm>

You'll find it essentially says exactly the same thing as what I explained to you previously, although in the author's own words.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Again, I will raise the point that what you are discussing here are not 'metaphysical arts', but rather paranormal, or parapsychological. I'm well familiar with both terms, though you seem to talk about it in a fashion indicative of a failing on my part in that regard.

Apparently you're not familiar, and thus why I bring it up. Parapsychology's definition, essentially wherever it is found, always begins with "The study of the evidence for..." This is of course somewhat mandated by the "-ology" suffix. And clearly we do not have our primary focus on the study of the evidence for these arts. If we did, we would have reformatted this community into a scientific research structure long ago. That's what I do for a living, and I'm well aware of how to structure a community in that fashion. This is simply not what our primary goals are here. You are free to think what you'd

like about what we should be doing with the hours in our day, but it is of course our choice regarding which area of this field we choose to focus on, the study of the evidence, or the study of the applied usage.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

Now you're catching on. Smiley

I have a sharp, reasonable, and critical mind, and I've proven the metaphysical arts to myself multiple times through objective externally observable evidence with enough concrete veracity that there is no remaining question or concern for me regarding their truth. Thus, they ARE factual, conclusive, and proven to me, and I choose to spend my days studying the applicability of these arts, rather than to spend my days repeatedly producing evidence for others. Surely you can understand that on a personal level of principle, even if you cannot bring yourself to believe my statements.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?"

We entirely agree upon the principle of error in forming an idea without basis upon which to form valid idea/opinion. I spoke earlier as to the error of your assumption, and the tone in which you are asserting it both previously, and again, here, and will address such now. Perhaps just over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various psuedo-scientific articles relating to the subject(s). I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years. So, if you seek to insinuate that I'm criticizing something I've no factual knowledge about, you insinuate in error.[/quote]

Well, now that was a very subtle turn of phrase. I asked you how many parapsychology journal articles you have read, and you responded "over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles".

You did NOT say "over 100 parapsychology journal articles". I'm sure you're well aware of the fact that articles describing how to do the occult, and other pseudoscientific articles, are NOT the same as a published parapsychology journal article. Like I said, if we're going to talk about science and reason, we're going to get it right. Perhaps we can try again, and you can answer the question asked: How many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion?

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I will start by stating that you note all of these tests discuss 'evidence' (not proof) of the above abilities,

Uh, yeah, of course. If you read pretty much any scientific paper you will see the measurements and their analysis labeled "evidence" and not "proof". This is the standard language of science, and it goes to the core definition of the scientific method. The key thing to look at is the reported "strength" of the evidence, in which case the weight of parapsychology evidence, depending on which author you read, is pretty much always described as somewhere between "compelling", "conclusive", "overwhelming", and "astronomical".

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

and that even your "fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks" along with the follow-on winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, offer only that even if such abilities as above mentioned exist, they perhaps only serve to increase the chance of knowing such things to a degree that might not even be statistically noteworthy or valid without an extended number of attempts.

Yes. That's because, as I explained to you in my previous post, THAT is what parapsychology tests. Parapsychology focuses on simple and highly controlled applications of psi such that the aspects of the experiment can be rigorously separated, the phenomena measured can be rigorously defined and quantified, and the results can be rigorously and directly analyzed with standard statistical tools. They get small consistent statistical results because the studies are designed for the express purpose of looking for small consistent statistical results. This has more scientific validity and conformity to the scientific method than a skilled participant moving an object in front of a researcher.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Further, you will note that is TWO supports in a community FULL of vastly more accomplished skeptics and more educated beings, as well as the overwhelming majority of other Noble Prize winners, who would disagree and do not share their findings.

Really now? Perhaps you can quote me the survey upon which you base your opinions? Or maybe you can show me how many hundreds of journal articles you have read from this "vast" community of "accomplished skeptics"?

You'll excuse me if I find this a little silly, but as I have actually read through much of the existing scientific literature, I am well aware of what you would find if you were to do so. So when you say things that clearly demonstrate to me that you have not read this literature, and then act with an air as if you have read it, it comes across as a little ridiculous...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Also, I'll note that they do not open the floor to critical review and assessment of their

findings and assertions by their peers in the scientific community; they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low.

Again, if you had read through the parapsychology literature, you would have a very hard time missing the many publications of Jessica Utts. Her publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals largely consist of statistical analyses, and have been highly cited as a reference in literature since the early 90s. This would be hard to miss in even a casual perusal of the field...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low.

The architects of the studies being analyzed did not set out to create huge success rates. They set out to maximize "statistical significance", not "success rates", and to do so in a way that is maximally repeatable. To maximize repeatability, it is required that you do not use special or talented participants in your study, and it is required that you conduct your study in such a way that the participants do not become fatigued. Then, for any consistent (even if weak) phenomena, statistical significance becomes a function of the amount of trials conducted by a study which continue to show this consistent phenomena. What the studies they analyze show is that psi is consistent and overwhelmingly significant (meaning, present and real with astronomical certainty) in the general untrained population.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Ironically, she is a credible statistician, with a credible scientific backer, that accounts for an infinitesimally small portion of a percent of community that by and large, disagrees with her entirely. Cheesy

Again, the survey you're quoting from here when you reference the scientific community as a whole? (Or perhaps, the review article which assesses the commonly published conclusion?)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Quote

"Now on this you and I definitely agree. But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others"

I have, and was waiting for someone to take this direction. I'm pleased I didn't have to wait long. That principle affects all of us to mutual degree. The difference is that I am forming rational assertions and using the tools of logic and rational thought to pursue my viewpoint, and thereby have some modicum of buffer to natural, emotional

discolorations of opinion, whereas those supporting this paranormal bunkery are not.

Ahhhh, I see. So you mean you think things that agree with your belief are "rational" and "natural", and those that disagree with your belief are not. Well doesn't that sound like good logic. :-P

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I will demonstrate several of those courses of logic, by which, even without independant study upon the subject at hand, one might easily arrive upon the rational belief that psychic abilities and magic are fallacies. A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existance, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above.

Sure. Take a magnet off your fridge. Now wave your little hand behind the magnet and try to touch the magnetic flux lines. Then, put the magnet back on the fridge and stop using silly philosophical presumptions to discredit things.

"Intangible" is not a scientific concept. "Non-interacting" is a more useful one. And there are of course countless examples of things which interact only with certain other types of things, and only in certain conditions, and in other conditions are non-interacting.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

B) If a thing exists, it exists always, unless some greater forces acts in cancellation/destruction. If someone has a talent, that talent is always present. Someone that can play chess very well, can always play chess very well. It doesn't come and go with concentration or skeptic watchers. A talented basketball player is always a talented basketball player, in so far as the talent goes, outside of exterior detrimental effects like age, injury, drugs, etc. Even on an "off" day, he or she is better than the average player, and the talent even on an off day is noticable.

Clearly you don't play chess. I do play chess fairly well, and I can assure you, my chess ability changes substantially with my mood that day, my state of health, and my mental state of focus, among other things. This may be hard to notice if you are a beginning chess player, but when you start using more of the brain to play the game, ability becomes highly modulated by human factors like this.

If we are to use a basketball analogy, consider this: Even on a bad day, a representative basketball professional, whom we shall call "Shaq", can make baskets much better than an amateur. But now, lets give our representative Shaq a more difficult task, such as shooting baskets from half court. On a good day, Shaq can probably make an impressive number of these. On a bad day, or perhaps with people standing behind Shaq shouting that he's a fraud and not a good basketball player, I

suspect our poor Shaq would make very few, if any, of those baskets from half court.

Your fallacy begins when you presume that somehow, if a talent or skill is possible, it must also be easy and require no focus. This could not be farther from the truth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

C) Real things that are fantastical and sensational, are generally well known. Many people know about the baby in Germany that's 'super strong' due to a strange birth defect that left him without the genes that account for the atrophy of unused muscle. World records, like the fastest running man, the strongest lifting, etc, are well documented. If such fantastical, sensational powers like the ability to lift or move objects with the mind really existed, they'd be well documented as fact, and well known. There'd be names in world record books, as to who could move the most mentally, or who's the most accurate precognitive, etc, etc.

And when the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center surveyed 1473 adults and asked how many had experienced ESP, 67% said that they had. It doesn't sound to me like this is wallowing in obscurity.

Personally, I'm not fond of appeals to popularity, and so I don't intend to pursue this as a line of argument. I'm just pointing out that your criticism that psi is false because it is unknown does not appear to be valid.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Stage magicians often induce the same reactions you describe. I suppose that makes their "magic" real, too, mm?

And Hollywood producers can make wonderful productions of moon landings. I suppose that makes those Apollo "missions" real, too, mm? Oh wait, that's right, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored.

Call it a repeated pattern of observation...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Since you seem fond of pointing to supporting links, shall I begin giving you links for a good place to start along the rational, logical approach to reality and critical thinking, by linking the NUMEROUS, overwhelming scientific resources that debunk psychic and magical claims, or skeptical sites that would further educate you as to the mysteries of the error of thinking involved in harboring such a belief system?

Oh, please do. Smiley

Then maybe we can debate real substance rather than silly rhetoric.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I can only, as you have, make the assumption that you have not made a study of rational thought and logical thinking. Shall I point you in that direction as well? Grin

I think I would find such a debate most amusing, but it would probably distract significantly from our topic of discussion here.

Quote from: MachineChimera

Yes, that is the definition of a Theory: Something that can neither be proven or disproven.

cringe That's a pretty bad pop-definition of "theory", and is the type of definition that has led to stupidity like the "evolution is just a theory" campaign. Let us instead use, "A set of statements or principles devised to explain a group of facts or phenomena, especially one that has been repeatedly tested or is widely accepted and can be used to make predictions about natural phenomena." --dictionary.com

Quote from: MachineChimera

As to gravity, you have not evidently familiarized yourself with the gravitational theories of Stephen Hawking; gravity is, to the best of present scientific theory's consideration, a PHYSICAL force...

You appear to have not familiarized yourself with the writings of a guy named MachineChimera. He did not mention "physical forces", he said "tangible", which of course means, "discernable by the touch".

Quote from: MachineChimera

Books: The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a candle in the Dark, by Carl Sagan. I am Therefore I Think: A Skeptical Manifesto, by Michael Shermer. Truth, Knowledge, Or Just Plain Bull: How To Tell The Difference: A Handbook of Practical Logic and Clear Thinking, by Bernard Patten. Skeptical Odysseys: Personal Accounts by the World's Leading Paranormal Inquirers, as edited by Paul Kurtz. Pseudoscience and the Paranormal, 2nd edition, by Terence Hines. Secrets of the Psychics: Investigating Paranormal Claims, by Massimo Polidoro. The Psychology of the Psychic, by David Marks.

Also, the following weblinks are quite handy.

<http://www.skeptic.com/>

-<http://www.randi.org/> (You'll note he offered \$10,000 initially to ANYONE that could demonstrate actual psychic, supernatural, or paranormal powers. At present, the challenge amount is in excess of \$700,000.)

<http://www.csicop.org>
<http://www.csicop.org/si/9511/eyewitness.html>
<http://www.csicop.org/si/9603/claims.html>
<http://atheism.about.com/od/skepticismnews/>
<http://www.ntskeptics.org/>

How many scientific studies have been conducted by those book authors and by these websites in total? An approximate sum would do nicely.

Logged
Salubrion
Greenhorn
A Veritas Regular
**

Posts: 64
Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #41 on: July 11, 2006, 01:33:09 PM »

Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok.

Logged
MachineChimera
Settling In
*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #42 on: July 11, 2006, 03:22:44 PM »

Quote

"Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok."

Rm.. glad to be of service? :d Gratitude for the credit, although I've not hardly begun to go around with Kobok. Stick around and wait for the dust to settle, neh? Wink

Logged

SethLaRoth DeShawl

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 581

Karma: 10

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #43 on: July 11, 2006, 03:25:55 PM »

Quote from: Salubrion on July 11, 2006, 01:33:09 PM

Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok.

Not to mention Rare. Bet he dies popping aan artary.

throws a Twenty

Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #44 on: July 11, 2006, 06:00:49 PM »

Quote

Answer the question, wise ass.

Now, we stoop to who speaks English better? Did you not agree to keep all the silliness out of this thread when a moderator spoke to you</rhetorical question>

Metaphysical (adj.)

2: Transcending physical matter.
Source: Oxford English Dictionary

Now, I am no scholar, but is Oxford not one of them fancy rich people schools, for learnin' and stuff?

In answer to your actual question: I would have to concede that your perception is correct, and that I practise "spookery" Since I do not adhere to your false pretence, there is no way to give you a truthful response. There is no magick/psychic forum here, so you may have to be more specific in the future. - Solstice

Gladly. I don't have a degree at present, though, honestly, I'm amused that you ask. Pray tell, what degree would qualify one to make statements about the vast body of scientific refutations of psychic claims, magick, and other paranormal spookery? I suppose a B.A. of Skepticism? Though, it's your turn to answer, since you seem to feel a degree is necessary to lend a valid opinion or understanding of a subject: What degree do you hold in regard to paranormal practices? Maybe you went to the same school Harry Potter did? Yeah. I didn't think so.

Also, nice use of the Oxford. How about you stop looking past the first, PRIMARY definition of Metaphysical, however? I'll give you some help, since you seemed to have overshot it in your scrambling haste to get to some defensible position of your former ignorance. Grin If you'll turn your eyes -just- a half inch below the following periods...

Metaphysics

- plural noun usu. treated as sing. 1 philosophy concerned with abstract concepts such as the nature of existence or of truth and knowledge.

I hope that cleared some stuff up for you. It's a rare chance I get to correct someone as to the meaning of a the same word Twice, much less in the same thread. Now, if you'll excuse me, I've some things to address with Kobok.

Quote

"Because "paranormal" includes all sorts of topics such as ghosts, and sasquatches, and little monsters swimming in British lakes, and ufos, and so forth. These topics are well outside of our common interests, and have nothing to do with the metaphysical arts.

Calling it an obscurity of this community is a significant misassessment. You need do little more investigation than googling the word "metaphysics", and noting that the first link is a wiki article which discusses the philosophy, and the second link is this article titled "Metaphysics: Multiple Meanings":

<http://www.websyte.com/alan/metamul.htm>

You'll find it essentially says exactly the same thing as what I explained to you previously, although in the author's own words."

The qualm lies not with the slangish bastardization of the word's meaning to be inclusive of such fantasy things that are not at all concerned with the seeking of truths about the universe by rational means, since they use no rational means in their advancement in such places as this, but with your bumbling attempt at "explanation", then: had you actually used the writer's words in the first place, it would have been evident that such a meaning exists outside've a poll spontaneously taken in this community to use such a term. I, being not an actual crystal waving, sigil tracing, power word invoking Student of the Arkana am familiar only with the proper, original, ACADEMIC meaning of the term, having not read that particular book out of 1967, and not hanging around in such spookery circles. You'll stave off such misunderstandings in the future if you actually make concise reference to your source in the defense of your usage of a term. Notwithstanding that the subjects you are discussing are equally as close to metaphysics as ufo's, the big foot, Loch Ness Monster, and ghosts, among other things. And have as much proof as to your own claims' validities as the other stories can produce. Wee.

Also, I might well have stumbled across that article as the second link in google, if I'd had to google it. Some of us have, again, had formal studies, and do not need to Google to understand words. I've known the meaning of Metaphysics for some time, and actually turned to verify it with the American Heritage. We see again, however, the means in which you regularly handle things you don't understand, as it appears the foremost thought in your mind for the way to find information is to google it. An odd choice of research, for someone that attempted to lecture last post about the need to do some formal study before forming an opinion about something... or does Google count as research credible toward a magnitude of 10, these days?

Quote

"Apparently you're not familiar, and thus why I bring it up. Parapsychology's definition, essentially wherever it is found, always begins with "The study of the evidence for..." This is of course somewhat mandated by the "-ology" suffix. And clearly we do not have our primary focus on the study of the evidence for these arts. If we did, we would have reformatted this community into a scientific research structure long ago. That's what I do for a living, and I'm well aware of how to structure a community in that fashion. This is simply not what our primary goals are here. You are free to think what you'd like about what we should be doing with the hours in our day, but it is of course our choice regarding which area of this field we choose to focus on, the study of the evidence, or the study of the applied usage."

Awwr.. and I thought you'd be familiar with the original meaning of parapsychology, since you were aware of same for Metaphysics. Or maybe you just looked the latter up etymologically? Evidently, if you Dictionary.com it, it lists such primarily. Dictionary.com however is not the all inclusive source for definitions, though even it were, the very same search lists a little further, in the American Heritage Stedman's

Dictionary, "The study of extrasensory perception, such as telepathy, psychokinesis, and clairvoyance." Which is, as I'm sure you are aware, since you claim to be in the business of scientific research for such things, closer to the etymological truth of the word's intended, first use and meaning, as originally used by psychologist Max Dessoir around 1889, in response to the article "The Prophet." Then again, you do not use the term Metaphysics as it was initially created and intended, here, so why would you do likewise for Parapsychological? Silly me. Also silly me, for thinking it ridiculous to attempt discussion of the "practical applications" of supposed forces that cannot even be proven to exist. Sort've jumping the gun on that one, aren't you? It's like you went all out on the nursery, and the baby isn't even due yet.

Quote

"Now you're catching on.

I have a sharp, reasonable, and critical mind, and I've proven the metaphysical arts to myself multiple times through objective externally observable evidence with enough concrete veracity that there is no remaining question or concern for me regarding their truth. Thus, they ARE factual, conclusive, and proven to me, and I choose to spend my days studying the applicability of these arts, rather than to spend my days repeatedly producing evidence for others. Surely you can understand that on a personal level of principle, even if you cannot bring yourself to believe my statements."

Gasp All that, and so modest to boot! I'd congratulate you, but I hate to follow good news with bad; you aren't the only boyo on the block with a nimble brain, and you've gone and spoiled your claims of both reasonability -and- being critically minded when you chased it with a statement of self-validation. Sure you've proven it to yourself. You must be one hell of a scientific investigator, if that's even true, if you account the claimaint in question as being a valid source of verification. FYI, though, I'm not catching on. I'm waiting for you to catch UP. Tsk.

Quote

"Well, now that was a very subtle turn of phrase. I asked you how many parapsychology journal articles you have read, and you responded "over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles".

You did NOT say "over 100 parapsychology journal articles". I'm sure you're well aware of the fact that articles describing how to do the occult, and other pseudoscientific articles, are NOT the same as a published parapsychology journal article. Like I said, if we're going to talk about science and reason, we're going to get it right. Perhaps we can try again, and you can answer the question asked: How many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion?"

Mm, indeed, there IS a large difference between texts and parapsychological journal articles: I was giving you the benefit of the doubt in assuming you meant by the question to ask how many valid sources for parapsychological studies had I read, and simply bungled the proper choice of words, as again, that is the modus operandi here thusfar, it

seems. I've read probably between 25 and 35 journal articles, at best guess. The mainstay of my reading has been actual BOOKS, not journals. Compilations, treatise, histories, accountings of paranormal and ESP testing and organizations, the results of such, etc. I guess that's what I get for giving you the benefit of the doubt. Somebody should promptly contact the literate community at large however, and notify them post haste that books are no longer the avant garde of reliable non-electronic information storage, and that they should transition to periodicals and journals.

Quote

"Uh, yeah, of course. If you read pretty much any scientific paper you will see the measurements and their analysis labeled "evidence" and not "proof". This is the standard language of science, and it goes to the core definition of the scientific method. The key thing to look at is the reported "strength" of the evidence, in which case the weight of parapsychology evidence, depending on which author you read, is pretty much always described as somewhere between "compelling", "conclusive", "overwhelming", and "astronomical".

Sure you will, when it doesn't lead to conclusive affirmation of the existence or behavior of the subject of study. Usually, when something is thusly, conclusively validated and "proven", they use such terms as "Proof" and "proven". It's after such an assertion in the scientific community that follows a description of the evidences supporting their claim of proof. You probably aren't familiar with that however, as, since you seem to be claiming you're a scientist in a parapsychological organization, and thusly haven't studied anything that has led to being conclusively proven for quite some time. I'll let it go, this time, circumstances warranting. Honestly though, you should keep up with the procedures and usages of the word Proof in scientific publications, if you're going to argue it's validity or occurrence in said publications to laity. Also, you seem to be supremely out of contact with the scientific community as a whole, as I've not seen a single scientific publication of any seriousness or repute, using such terms as 'compelling', 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', or 'astronomical', when talking about the paranormal. In fact, it's rare at best to see such a subject even broached in such weighty papers, primarily because it's not taken seriously by the scientific body as a whole, much like Bigfoot, Loch Ness, Alien abductions, or ghosts. Then again, considering your claimed profession, I suppose you can't be entirely blamed for not knowing that, either, as there's no telling what matter of journals and periodicals -you- regularly read. Or have I missed a Nobel Prize consideration going out to a paranormal researcher, what with all this "compelling, conclusive, overwhelming" evidence supporting the existence of psychic hooplah and magick? I mean, heck, what with other nominations going out for theoretical discoveries, I'm SURE they'd at least give a look to somebody that could overwhelmingly, compellingly, conclusively provide support of such a claim as people being able to move things about with their minds, or know the future. How strange.

Quote

"Yes. That's because, as I explained to you in my previous post, THAT is what parapsychology tests. Parapsychology focuses on simple and highly controlled

applications of psi such that the aspects of the experiment can be rigorously separated, the phenomena measured can be rigorously defined and quantified, and the results can be rigorously and directly analyzed with standard statistical tools. They get small consistent statistical results because the studies are designed for the express purpose of looking for small consistent statistical results. This has more scientific validity and conformity to the scientific method than a skilled participant moving an object in front of a researcher."

That's one interesting way to look at it. Another might be, that they are only using statistical proof for things involving statistics, primarily relating to things that could fall within the realm of guesswork, and the calculation of odds of a successful guess. That is, they are testing only psychic phenomena statistically that involves potential guess-work, like "blind" cognitive tests, OOB reporting of distant, supposedly unknown locations, etc. Rather shockingly (.sarcasm.), psychic phenomena that aren't based upon statistics aren't recorded with any degree of success at all. As in "Can he move this can 10 feet away from him, on the other side of a glass panel?" That's because the success rate would be 0 out of .. infinity. Similarly for people who can 'create fire', or any physically manifested force. Most "ESP" phenomena in fact, are precognitive and clairvoyant in nature, because that's the only realm of psychic or 'magickal' claims that are actually tested with any degree of validation to submit as 'evidence' are things that people can get lucky at in guesswork. It's always "which symbol, out of 8 possible, is on this card", and partial successes are included for such things as a regular deck of cards. "Oh, he got the suit right, but not the face value. That's got to mean something." You'll note that none of these conclusive tests involve specific, intricate information for an OOB, or a cognitive. Reading someone's mind doesn't ever produce "He's holding a letter that has 10 words on it. The 10 words are "I do not believe this crap is actually being tested." How strange; evidently your otherworldly uber1337 hacx0r powerz only allow vague successes. Again, a pattern is forming! *shock!*

Quote

"Really now? Perhaps you can quote me the survey upon which you base your opinions? Or maybe you can show me how many hundreds of journal articles you have read from this "vast" community of "accomplished skeptics"?"

You'll excuse me if I find this a little silly, but as I have actually read through much of the existing scientific literature, I am well aware of what you would find if you were to do so. So when you say things that clearly demonstrate to me that you have not read this literature, and then act with an air as if you have read it, it comes across as a little ridiculous..."

What is ridiculous, is your feigned demeanor of actual knowledge on the subject, when you assert claims that are ridiculous. I'm not sure what you consider 'scientific literature', but I consider it to be materials produced by people with actual degrees, and the opinions of people with said degrees in the pertaining fields of study. There is a reason why "Parapsychology" is considered a joke by most serious scientists, and why scientific conventions and award communities aren't ever giving up mentions or praise

for that manner of thing. They are discussing quantum mechanics, physics, molecular biology, and so on for the advancements. Note that valid sources of study are taught in schools as coursework and curriculum. Note also that parapsychological claims like yours do not exist in classrooms, outside of the study of such claims/search for evidence; there are no accredited schools offering coursework in psionics disciplines, magical spellcraft, etc. Why is that? You don't seem to get it. Maybe this will help clear your head: Susan Blackmore ring a bell? A DOCTOR of parapsychology, who has, in her entire career, found NO evidence or reproducible success of any psi phenomena. "For instance, she wrote in 1996: "When I decided to become a parapsychologist I had no idea it would mean 20 years of failing to find the paranormal." Blackmore has made a career for herself as one of the world's most well known skeptics of psi, and in 1988 was elected a Fellow of CSICOP." She's hardly alone. Perhaps you should check out the CSICOP site for yourself, since you seem to be dwelling in a fantasy land where actual scientists accept psionics as a valid, existant force, or concept worthy of study. I'll also point out that a myriad number of healthy minds go into such fields as quantum mechanics and theoretical physics specifically to seek out the answers to the mysterious forces in the universe. Compare the number of such healthy, brilliant minds to the number of people pursuing parapsychology degrees. I don't think we even need to look up the actual numbers coming out in the respective degrees, or compare the number of truly brilliant, gifted minds that have gone into the former fields, and the number of same that have chosen the latter. You might wonder as to why these things are, but it's pretty plain to anyone of a rational bent, why that is. Let me help you out in that regard as well. "The Observer newspaper published at the time, David Deutsch, a quantum physicist at Oxford University, described Josephson's claim as "utter rubbish" and went on to say there is no evidence that paranormal phenomena actually exist. Asked by Physics World whether the paranormal might become a respectable area of research, Deutsch was still highly dismissive "One day Santa Claus might turn out to be a respectable area of research. All one can say is that there is no better evidence for the one than for the other." "Physicists have an emotional response when they hear anything connected with parapsychology," he says. "Their opinion of parapsychology research is not based on evaluation of the evidence but on a dogmatic belief that all research in this field is false." From PhysicsWeb.org, the following. "Most readers of Physics World will probably dismiss paranormal phenomena as either utter nonsense or not worthy of serious study." Since you aren't familiar with such Journals, it seems, I'll help you out further: do try to find a single article that HAS made it into an actual periodical or publication within the scientific community, which you purport to be a part of, that wasn't attacked outright by not merely a large volume of readers, but by the MAJORITY of them. Kthnx. And get a picture of the Unicorn when you do. Wink

Quote

"Again, if you had read through the parapsychology literature, you would have a very hard time missing the many publications of Jessica Utts. Her publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals largely consist of statistical analyses, and have been highly cited as a reference in literature since the early 90s. This would be hard to miss in even a casual perusal of the field..."

I'll direct you to read not merely Jessica Utt's publications, but the even HARDER to miss rebuttals and skeptical counteranalyses made by her opponents. Conveniently, you make no mention of these, and seem to imply that Jessica Utts, merely by stating (However weakly her claims did, at all, support ESP testings she did analysis of, by pretty much asserting it wasn't a perfect ability so much as a slightly higher ability to get a statistically superior number of the test criterion passes, if one drew out the testing long enough. Again, she also stated in the same article that was linked that the abilities of psychics tested are pretty much inconsequential and unnoteworthy, unless one drew out tests over a longer period of time. AND once again, in tests relating to guess work, miraculously, not 100% do or do not physically manifestable psychic claims, or specific test criteria that cannot be guessed at with any accuracy.) her backing of the results as evidence of ESP activity, has made it so. Try reviewing the detractions made by the reviewers and respondents in the scientific community to said publications.

Quote

"The architects of the studies being analyzed did not set out to create huge success rates. They set out to maximize "statistical significance", not "success rates", and to do so in a way that is maximally repeatable. To maximize repeatability, it is required that you do not use special or talented participants in your study, and it is required that you conduct your study in such a way that the participants do not become fatigued. Then, for any consistent (even if weak) phenomena, statistical significance becomes a function of the amount of trials conducted by a study which continue to show this consistent phenomena. What the studies they analyze show is that psi is consistent and overwhelmingly significant (meaning, present and real with astronomical certainty) in the general untrained population."

Of course they didn't. They'd fail 100% percent of the time. Which is why they structure the tests the way they do: the only way that they can get results that can even be argued to be significant evidence of the claims being purported. Any studies being analyzed for an actual, Huge success rate, which would be in following with.. something that actually is factual, like a working mathematical formula, a new invention's actual ability to do what it's claimed to do, or a new discovery that can actually be displayed. Again, this is not what ESP is all about, because ESP isn't real. If it were real, such Huge successes could be demonstrated: You can't really argue statistically or otherwise, someone moving a cup through a glass panel, 10' away, with their mind. You can conclusively prove that no outside forces were acting to cause the movement, and attribute the movement to the claim itself. Especially if such power actually existed, because it could be repeated. A telekinetic is always a telekinetic, if such a thing actually was. The power wouldn't just leave them the moment it's used. Or is this the part where the usual lame excuses come in, about "Your skeptic energy disrupted by focus" or "I can't concentrate today." Wah-wah-waaaaaaah. The only thing "Consistant" about these studies is their vagueness (Again, test subjects are never asked to describe a symbol on a card that's unique in a deck of say, 2,000 options, or to describe the contents of a 10 word sentence. It's always a number or a symbol, usually

one they've already seen, as in they're shown the options in the deck or cards, and one that has a pretty rational chance of being guessed at blindly in occurrence, however marginalized that chance is.), and the fact that they're always inconclusive, and at best "might indicate" "something" out of the average is occurring. If, as Jessica Utts pointed out nicely, the test results are considered in a broad enough range.

Quote

"Again, the survey you're quoting from here when you reference the scientific community as a whole? (Or perhaps, the review article which assesses the commonly published conclusion?)"

See above for instances of actually weighty, regularly published scientific journal(s), and the opinions generally held by the scientific community of readers.

Quote

"

Ahhhh, I see. So you mean you think things that agree with your belief are "rational" and "natural", and those that disagree with your belief are not. Well doesn't that sound like good logic. :-P"

Rather, I think that things that derive from rational arrival or deduction are "rational", and those that are not arrived upon by rational means, but by irrational ones, are not. It is rational to have solid evidence of a thing's existence before attempting or 'practicing' it. One does not practice the martial arts before learning that at least once does in fact, exist. If you just decide that something you've heard debated about actually exists, and begin trying to do it in your own home, you cannot just imagine you have seen successful results of your 'practice' and claim it to be of that martial art, when there's no actual record of the art's existence. You're just flailing around in your home, pretending to be doing something you think could be out there. That's what is called NON-rational, or irrational. Cheesy

Quote

"Sure. Take a magnet off your fridge. Now wave your little hand behind the magnet and try to touch the magnetic flux lines. Then, put the magnet back on the fridge and stop using silly philosophical presumptions to discredit things.

"Intangible" is not a scientific concept. "Non-interacting" is a more useful one. And there are of course countless examples of things which interact only with certain other types of things, and only in certain conditions, and in other conditions are non-interacting."

I'm not sure you understand the meaning of touch. If I waved my hand through the magnetic flux lines, my skin/hand actually did touch, and pass through, the flux lines. Touch occurred. Intangibility, likewise, is not a scientific concept. Intangibility is a word based upon scientific concept: the concept of physicality, and physical properties.

Please do however, provide one of these 'countless examples' of a non-physically acting force that affects the physical world, or vice versa. That is, a force that does not operate physically, and does not have a physical source. Then, if you manage that (aha. Aha.), provide a demonstration of how such a force has been demonstrated to be capable of affecting a physical thing, i.e. something with physical properties. Again, Aha, aha. Hopefully I won't have to wait long, since you claim there are "countless" examples of such, yet strangely mentioned none. Hm.

Actually, I was taught to play Chess by Grandmaster Parham himself, using the Parham method that he specifically created. I'll forgive you yet another ignorant assumption, however, as I'm not fond of breaking a man's streak. Smiley I'll also forgive you your attempted condescending, yet again, since you have to have SOMETHING to make you feel good about yourself, and it clearly isn't what's coming out of that self-allegedly 'sharp, critical' brain of yours. I'll break it down for you, as your ability to glean meaning from text is also apparently suspect: I already specified that, while someone with talent may fluctuate in the ability they demonstrate due to environmental variables, the talent itself, regardless of it's degree of expression, is always present, and noticable to anyone that has talent themselves. No matter how 'off' you are emotionally, you are never going to come off as unskilled, if you are skilled, without intentional deception and attempt to hide your talent. Once you start playing chess for a while, you'll learn to pick up on certain things, like a person's emotional state, state of distraction, the measuring of their time per play versus their usual (once you start playing in tournaments, you'll get to watch regular players doing their thing, and maybe take note of how fast they usually run their game), and other such subtleties. You'll never mistake someone like Bobby Fischer for untalented, no matter HOW bad a day he's having, or his emotional mindset. I can only surmise that you've.. never actually seen true talent, if you haven't witnesses this to be the case? Michael Jordan, no matter how bad a day he was having, would never get schooled by the average basketball player, as another example. In fact, even ON His off nights, of which commentaries are made, if you happen to watch sports with any frequency involving top notch athletes, they are still successful. They are only below their curve and "having a bad night" in contrast to their usual phenomenal output. Your example is an addressment not of a disappearance of talent, which you in support of my own assertion (which you are at present attempting to ridicule? Choose a side, eh?) stated would still be apparent against an amateur, is an example of degree, not disappearance. I addressed that already, as well, by stating specifically that a person with talent may perform badly for his talent, but that talent is still evident. Again, when someone with a real Talent 'has a bad night', it is only in contrast to their usual capabilities.

Also, you yet again presume in error that I somewhere made the statement that talent is expressed without concentration or effort. Do, please, use your Sharp, Critical mind and scientific research abilities to find in my post where I indicated such, even subtly? Get back to me when you find that. It's probably buried with Jimmy Hoffa, who by chance will be holding the rifle that was used on the grassy knoll. I asserted only that a talent is repeatable, when it is possessed.. it doesn't appear one night, and disappear the next. If you can move something with your mind, you can move something with

your mind. The degree of application may fluctuate, but it does not altogether fail. A powerlifter never walks into a gym, maxing out at 450 lbs, and abruptly, because his 'concentration' isn't there and he's sore and lacking energy, fail to push 300 for example. Regardless of how into it he is, the talent actually exists, in that he has the muscle mass to do it. His motivation and energy levels are the single variables in the matter. If a person can move a soda can with their mind (Yay, useful talent, btw! If it existed, I'd seriously be so tauntful of it.), they can always move things with their mind, and it will only fluctuate in terms of how much, or for how long. If they can't push 10 ounces that night, they should at least be able to influence 5, or 1 ounce. But don't. A talent is, I dare say, never of the nature of "I can sometimes do it, sometimes not." It's merely a matter of degree in display/usage.

Quote

"And when the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center surveyed 1473 adults and asked how many had experienced ESP, 67% said that they had. It doesn't sound to me like this is wallowing in obscurity.

Personally, I'm not fond of appeals to popularity, and so I don't intend to pursue this as a line of argument. I'm just pointing out that your criticism that psi is false because it is unknown does not appear to be valid."

Again, your ability to entirely miss what is actually being said in the words you are supposedly reading, astounds me. I said that no documented claims of success were known, not that uneducated individuals at large did not hold a popular belief in fallacies, or know what the concepts discussed actually mean. How many people could be polled to know if Dragons exist, or elves? I bet they'd know what you meant about dragons and elves, respectively. Their knowledge of these terms CLEARLY has some relevance to the actual existance of these creatures, by your reasoning? w00t!! And, alternately, here's an insight that MAY serve you well in your "parapsychological research", if you actually do that for a living; people lie on polls. When polled as to the frequency of sex, numbers are generally trumped. The same is true for any number of other poll issues. You could poll any number of Americans to see how many actually follow luck based superstitions, like carrying rabbits feet, wearing a lucky article of clothing or color before a test, a special gym sock before a big game, carry a lucky coin on them, and so on. I suppose that indicates they all believe that their stinky sock actually affects how every other player in the game performs, if you asked them that question outright, or that a sliced off piece of rodent corpse is physically connected to some force that controls the functions of probability, or that color will somehow interact meaningfully with their brain's ability to recall information they should have paid attention to in class for the previous semester? So yes, way to use popular poll (which is itself, a WELL respected and renowned resource for evidence, it might be added. Way to lower the bar!!) as support for something that is generally supported only by anecdotal success stories. It's a refreshing change from the norm, at least.

Quote

"And Holywood producers can make wonderful productions of moon landings. I

suppose that makes those Apollo "missions" real, too, mm? Oh wait, that's right, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee..."

I'm not familiar with Hollywood, not being of a religious bend, but if you mean Hollywood, I'm hardly shocked that someone that's supporting crystal waving, sigil drawing chanting and invocations buys into conspiracy theory. Yes, the American government was able to involve literally thousands of government employees in a super-secret fraud involving billions of dollars that somehow weren't accounted for in the budgeting analysis of non-local department resources, and none of THOSE thousands of employees let slip this classified information to any of THEIR family members, etc, etc, etc. Thankfully, sharp, Critical minds like yourselves were able to so easily slice through the veil of mystery they'd woven with practiced information control policies and far, far more extensive financial and training resources than yourself. You really do think a lot of yourself, don't you. Quite frankly, if the government wanted to dupe you about something, you'd be pretty much up the proverbial creek, since they can afford to hire in Top Notch experts to review and assure that any hoax they did want to pull off would go seamlessly, and be impervious to the common scrutiny.

Quote

"Oh wait, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee..."

Thank you Kobok. I couldn't have put it better myself! Grin

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 04:53:42 AM

You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored."

Kobot - "Call it a repeated pattern of observation..."

I'll call it what I've been calling it all along; assumptive ignorance. Sharp and Critical mind, indeed.

Quote

"Oh, please do.

Then maybe we can debate real substance rather than silly rhetoric."

A debate of real substance? You're not at all interested in such a thing, you intellectual Tease, you. All you've provided thusfar were word-definition arguments and weak attempts at refutation in technical debate fashion of the attacks I'm asserting upon the matter of debate. You're providing no resources that, from the start, were asked for: scientifically backed proof, or even strong evidence of something that should, if real, be quite EASY to demonstrate and verify. It's hard to get confused by the demonstration of fire being spontaneously produced, or an object being decisively moved several feet away without being touched, or a specific set of information being related that couldn't possibly be guessed at. Yet none of these things are forthcoming. Again, no surprise.

That's how it's been for doctorates and degree-bearing parapsychologists since the inception of the field. You're basically professing to believing in something that hasn't been proven or conclusively demonstrated even by the greatest minds to come to the field from the point of it's creation to present. That's probably the most irrational part of the entire discourse... which is saying something, considering some of the claims you've made.

By the by.. you never DID mention where this 'publicity' you supposedly received for your 'been there, done that' demonstrations of your 1337 powerz came from? TELevised? Published? Or did you mean by 'publicity' that some people you demonstrated before were amazed by your little magic trick, and talked about it, since they didn't know how you pulled it off, or how to distinguish between actual demonstration and elements not at all related to what you were purporting to do? Jesus Christ, man. At least the professional charlatans like David Blain and Criss Angel perform their faux-supernatural tricks in front of a television camera and news crews. You really need to step up your game.

Quote

"*cringe* That's a pretty bad pop-definition of "theory", and is the type of definition that has led to stupidity like the "evolution is just a theory" campaign. Let us instead use, "A set of statements or principles devised to explain a group of facts or phenomena, especially one that has been repeatedly tested or is widely accepted and can be used to make predictions about natural phenomena."

If by "pretty bad pop-definition" of "theory" you mean "concise, extremely simplified version", then yes. You can use whichever you like, but both are equally true and applicable, unless you will make the claim that a Theory in fact can be proven or disproven? If that's the case, then by all means, refute, and I'll notify the pertinent defining authorities. If it's not the case, and you agree that such does apply perfectly to a Theory, then you're just... wasting text as filler in name-calling the simplified version. Whatever you've got to do to feel better about yourself, man. Wink

Quote

"You appear to have not familiarized yourself with the writings of a guy named MachineChimera. He did not mention "physical forces", he said "tangible", which of course means, "discernable by the touch".

You appear not to be familiar with the meaning of "touch", which is to cause or permit a part of the body to come into contact with. Something that is physical, like the body, cannot come into contact with, or "touch" something that is not physical/has no physical qualities.

Quote

"How many scientific studies have been conducted by those book authors and by these websites in total? An approximate sum would do nicely."

Hundreds, between the authors provided, and the website links, a large number of them specifically detailed in the texts. Several of the writers hold degrees in psychology or parapsychology, as well. Now then, I'd like the same information for the links I was provided? Also, how about some specifically detailed information about the nature of those 'statistically' successful trials Jessica Utts reports, and how the tests were conducted? Or are we to blindly accept that she tested reliably, in credible fashion, without knowing exactly the nature of the tests she ran. Allow me to blindly guess (don't confuse my success with psychic powah! I assure you, such is not the case.) what her tests involved: Random number generators, within a known set, "telepathic" testing with a person holding a card facing toward them, concentrating on the symbol, picture, or number on the card, while the person across from them attempts to "discern" what exactly is being projected to them/for them? Wow. AMAZING!

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 06:23:50 PM by MachineChimera » Logged

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.60.html>

1 capture

29 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

29

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 29, 2013, 04:41:21 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207331 Posts in 14732 Topics by 18409 Members - Latest Member: - nest4sudan
Most online today: 99 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6 7 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15060 times)

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #60 on: July 13, 2006, 03:14:01 PM »

Quote

"My ignorance?! HAHA. I guess I am going to have to repeat myself, since you did/can not read..."

METAPHYSICAL (ADJ)

2: Transcending physical matter.

Source: OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY

As for the privacy thing, I was meaning that people do not need to know about your interests in bondage. Speaking of which, in your forum post (you know where), you are wondering why people think you come off as aggressive, and that you have "never insulted anyone to [your] knowledge." Think again. Calling people "candylanders" (among other) things is an insult to those of us who are not socially inept.

While we are discussing your INTERESTS, let's also look at something else:

Taoism

With your massive intellect, I am sure even you can see how this brings into question your intentions with this forum. You have tao listed as one of your areas of interests on your Dilly profile. You do know that one of the tao philosophies includes ALCHEMY and DIVINATION."

Yes, your ignorance. This is the second time we've gone through just THIS exact transaction. Evidently, you don't read, or forget what you read soon thereafter. I'll reiterate, for your probable non-benefit. That's the SECOND definition in the Oxford English. What's the FIRST definition, braniac?

"metaphysical

- adjective 1 relating to metaphysics."

And the OXFORD definition of Metaphysics?

"metaphysics

- plural noun usu. treated as sing. 1 philosophy concerned with abstract concepts such as the nature of existence or of truth and knowledge."

I guess you didn't make it that far, huh? Awwr. Good try though!

As to my "private" life, again, if I was afraid or ashamed of my personal tastes and interests, I wouldn't be using the same name, and wouldn't have it be publically accessible information on the internet. Grin In that particular thread, I was pointing out that it seemed the lot of them were ganging up on me. I've since moved on to not caring, as the response tends to be much the same, the world over, whenever a new person shows up to rattle the cage: all the well-known regulars group together. Most people instinctively seek to protect what they're familiar with and know, rather than side with something new and unproven.

I for one aren't ashamed of my personal life, irregardless of this particular subject. I notice however that you aren't as forthcoming, and don't have any pictures up. There's probably a reason for that, huh? Grin Poor guy.

And yes, an interest in Taoism, does not mean I am a follower/believer. I'm also aware that most restaurants have meat in them. Being vegetarian, I tend to stay away from that sort've thing. The point being, you can enjoy something, without partaking of EVERYTHING that falls under it's umbrella.

Not surprisingly, that seemed to fly over your head too. Keep trying, though. One of these days, the ideas might start settling into place.

Logged
solstice
Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #61 on: July 13, 2006, 03:19:14 PM »

smacks forehead Was it not also explained to you, that when "metaphysical arts" is the context, then the second definition applies? (meta = beyond; physical...) The order in which the listings appear is irrelevant, since the literal translation of the word is exactly how I paraphrased.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory
freefallingdot

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 98

Karma: 0

The Knight of Swords

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #62 on: July 13, 2006, 03:29:57 PM »

I believe they explained to you several times that there are more than one definitions of the word. What order they appear in the dictionary is of no debatable value. If you feel an irrepressible need to bring irrelevant information to the table, it begs the question of why you started the debate in the first place. If it is merely to rant on about definitions and their order in the *edited* dictionary, do not expect people to take you seriously. In the case of the articles you read, would you mind PM ing me some of the information you read in them, and some of the links you used.

Also, if you question the existence of the occult, yet won't agree on definitions of words, how in the hell do you expect for your mind to be changed?

Just giving my piece of the pie,

FFD

Logged

Boldly, I bow to the banished, bend knee to the broken, and break bread with the bereaved. Behold the breath-taking beauty of brutality, of quick and permanent change, breaking the lines built to separate polarities. Brashly blending that which can't be bent.

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #63 on: July 13, 2006, 03:39:16 PM »

I'm actually going to have to side with machinechimera on this particular issue, solstice. If you took a mention of "metaphysics" from somewhere outside Veritas, it is most likely referring to the regular old mundane branch of philosophy, and has nothing to do with what we do around here. You can't force him to have been using the second definition when he meant the first. I highly endorse the notion that this entire side-discussion about the word "metaphysics" be dropped, simply because it's so stupid and distracting from an otherwise interesting discussion.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #64 on: July 13, 2006, 03:49:43 PM »

In that case, it was not which definition, but WHO knew what it meant. The original argument was that "spookery" and metaphysical arts were fake -- so, unless our beefy friend is a liar and a hypocrite, then he was in fact refering to the second definition, by implication.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #65 on: July 13, 2006, 03:54:50 PM »

Quote

"*smacks forehead* Was it not also explained to you, that when "metaphysical arts" is the context, then the second definition applies?

(meta = beyond; physical...) The order in which the listings appear is irrelevant, since the literal translation of the word is exactly how I paraphrased." -Solstice

Quote

I believe they explained to you several times that there are more than one definitions of the word. What order they appear in the dictionary is of no debatable value. If you feel an irrepressable need to bring irrelevant information to the table, it begs the question of why you started the debate in the first place. If it is merely to rant on about definitions and their order in the *edited* dictionary, do not expect people to take you seriously. In the case of the articles you read, would you mind PM ing me some of the information you read in them, and some of the links you used.

Also, if you question the existence of the occult, yet won't agree on definitions of words, how in the hell do you expect for your mind to be changed?

Just giving my piece of the pie,

FFD

As Zake addressed, I was not arguing that the second definition was invalid. I was disputing the implication you were attempting to cram down my throat, Solstice, that I

was somehow hypocritical for having Metaphysics as an interest on one of my pages.

As to you, FFD, I'm afraid I would mind PMing you to provide the information in the links. You are free to click on them and read them for yourself, if they are of interest to you, as Kobok has done. Further, since you didn't seem to grasp the notion, I was, as Zake clearly understood, not arguing over the order of the definitions. I was citing it once more to make rebuttal to Solstice's evident nonunderstanding as to the above instance of Metaphysics as an interest of mine. In fact, the entire 'rant' of arguing about the definition of words started because Solstice, before I even engaged the debate in this particular forum, was ignorant of Metaphysics' actual pre-50's meaning, sadly enough, and thought to name me ignorant for the actual primary/original definition with which I was familiar.

And, since you evidently haven't been following the discussion thusfar, I'll clue you in: I've agreed to the use of "Metaphysical" in the regard of the so called "Metaphysical arts", once Kobok made me familiar with the term's usage in this community, originating from the late mid of the 20th century.

Quote

In that case, it was not which definition, but WHO knew what it meant. The original argument was that "spookery" and metaphysical arts were fake -- so, unless our beefy friend is a liar and a hypocrite, then he was in fact refering to the second definition, by implication. -Solstice

Yes, that metaphysical arts. Not Metaphysics. I have an expressed interest on the website you were referring to, in Metaphysics, not Metaphysical arts, and consider the "Metaphysical arts" as they're called, to be fantasy. Metaphysics itself, is a factual philosophical interest.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 04:05:42 PM by MachineChimera » Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #66 on: July 13, 2006, 04:09:12 PM »

Metaphysical arts and "metaphysics" are the same damn thing. One is the adjective, and another is the individual disciplines that ARE metaphysical... you know, what you called candied spookery.

Psychic/psionic pursuits are NOT physical; the mechanism is a METAPHYSICAL one. If you understood what either meant, you would know this.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #67 on: July 13, 2006, 04:19:00 PM »

Quote

"Metaphysical arts and "metaphysics" are the same damn thing. One is the adjective, and another is the individual disciplines that ARE metaphysical... you know, what you called candied spookery.

Psychic/psionic pursuits are NOT physical; the mechanism is a METAPHYSICAL one. If you understood what either meant, you would know this."

You.. continue to astound me. It's like it goes in one ear and out the other. ;o

Shakes head to dispel incredulity.

Alright, I'll try this in smaller, slower words. Metaphysics, and Metaphysical arts, are two different subjects indeed. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy. Metaphysical arts, is a phrase coined in the 50's, to be used as a blanket term for such things as psionic and magickal activity. If you still think they're the same thing, check the definition of Oxford again. Or try running Metaphysical Arts through oxford and see what, if anything, comes up.

And, yeah, Psychic/psionic pursuits are not necessarily physical. Punching someone in the face is not legal, but studying Law does not mean you are studying punching someone in the face. Is that simple enough for you? Did you get that? Here's another example of how, Just because A is true for B, does not mean B is true for A: Martial arts is a study involving self control. That does not mean that if you are studying self control, you are studying martial arts. So yes, while your claimed Psychic spookery is not a physical thing, and would potentially fall under the definition of

Metaphysics, Metaphysics itself is not the study of psychic spookery, and does not necessarily include that. Ideas and emotions are not physical either, and Metaphysics is not the study of thought. That falls under Psychology's realm.

Logged
solstice
Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm
« Reply #68 on: July 13, 2006, 04:46:05 PM »
Meta = beyond.
Physical == Physical

Which part of that is philosophical?

Logged
Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.
Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory
MachineChimera
Settling In
*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm
« Reply #69 on: July 13, 2006, 04:47:18 PM »
Quote

""TRANSCENDING PHYSICAL MATTER" is NOT a philosophy. What astounds me, is how you keep ignoring that, when someone brings into context your ranting on metaphysics, yet dont seem to adhere to one definition. How is it one interests you, but

when the other is mentioned, you claim the person does not understand you?
Remember, it was you that mentioned this topic in the first place, in your original rant at the Commite. So, dont come up in here and say something contrary. You know that you mean the second definition and you know that I do, too. Get over it."

LOL! You are just.. god. I'm glad this is actually being saved in text format for posterity's sake. I may need a good laugh now and then, and a place to point friends to. Grin

Are you stating that Metaphysics is not a philosophy, by oxford's definition? Or merely that the Secondary definition of Metaphysics isn't? If the latter, allow me to say a resounding DUH. If the former, then I don't know what you're blathering about. I didn't say that the secondary definition was a philosophy. I said Metaphysics is. Metaphysics is the philosophy I was listing as an interest on the page you looked at to see such initially. Metaphysics, does not equal Metaphysical arts. Metaphysics can be used, as an alternate definition, to refer to Metaphysical arts, but when used such, it is not being used to mean the Philosophy. The philosophy, and it's use in reference to the "spookery" of so called "Metaphysical arts", are two different definitions/things. If, after all this, you STILL do not understand, I'd recommend you get with Zake, Kobok, or somebody else of a respectable mind, and have them explain it to you in terms you can understand. I'm evidently incapable of lowering myself to the speaking language with which you discern meanings.

Quote

"Meta = beyond.

Physical == Physical

Which part of that is philosophical?"

Oh, Good. You changed it. A shame I captured your original statement before you could alter it. Cheesy! Ahem.

Which part? How about the original creation of the word. "-al = of, or relating to. So, Metaphysical is "of, or relating to, Metaphysic". Do an etymological search for Metaphysics. Here, I'll do it for you.

"from Greek (Ta) meta (ta) phusika, (the works) after the Physics, the title of Aristotle's treatise on first principles (so called because it followed his work on physics)"

There you go. You actually -learned- something today. You learned where the word Metaphysics comes from, and why it's the term for the philosophy that it is. Grin

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 04:52:43 PM by MachineChimera » Logged
solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #70 on: July 13, 2006, 04:53:39 PM »

Dude, I deleted my post before you replied... I did some back-tracking.

Turns out that you replied to me for no real reason at all, speaking of illiterate. I said the "people" who posted originally on the other site did not know what metaphysical means. Since we know you have one definition down, yet you actually came back and accused ME of not knowing. Where is this aggression coming from? I already posted the Oxford definition twice.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Prophecy

Theurgist

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1230

Karma: 62

[Veritas Teacher](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #71 on: July 13, 2006, 05:01:55 PM »

Well, I certainly do not have the time to read through all five pages of this post, but I must say that there is some ground to any argument to be had regarding context and exact definition.

Metaphysics is, above all, the study of things beyond the physical. To use it in its proper term, you would be referring to philosophies such as those presented in

Aristotle's "Of Metaphysics" and Immanuel Kant's "Prolegomena." The philosophy presented in such works, though I believe they hold great value to the spiritualist, in fact has little to do with the practical branch of spirituality which has here been decided to be called metaphysics. Deciding upon calling it this, though in fact metaphysical philosophy does not involve many aspects of the arts practiced here, is not entirely fallacious however. Much of the spiritual practices here, which are often called "metaphysics," in fact all share very common grounds in the theoretical science of Metaphysical Philosophy, usually using the theories proposed by the great metaphysical philosophers to establish the theories of practical spirituality. For example, then, metaphysics argues (most of the time) favourably regarding the existence of a soul, and it is likewise argued by some metaphysicists, such as the Hebrew scholars and Christian theologians, that this soul is made in the exact image of God. This idea is further built upon by the same theologians and philosophers to decide exactly what this statement means, and it is the general consensus amongst this group that the soul contains inherent within it all the forces within God, and, by extension, the potential for the divine authority which God has. Magicians then take these working philosophies and make the connection that if one releases the potential of the soul to obtain divine authority, then he may influence the world in a manner similar to a god. The only place where practical spirituality steps beyond the realm of theoretical metaphysics is when a group of people decides how to experiment with and verify the claim.

It is correct in the same sense, however, to say that in the end what is practiced is not metaphysics by its traditional term, should you not be willing to accept a rather irrelevant semantical change. Technically what is practiced here would be, according to the Oxford Dictionary, either occultism or sorcery, regardless of the things which a practicing occultist knows separates the many branches of spiritual practice from sorcery. These things, after all, are known to the initiated and not to the authors of the Oxford Dictionary.

Logged
<http://www.thedivinescience.org>
MachineChimera
Settling In
*

Posts: 37
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm
« Reply #72 on: July 13, 2006, 05:11:30 PM »
Quote

"Dude, I deleted my post before you replied... I did some back-tracking.
Turns out that you replied to me for no real reason at all, speaking of illiterate. I said the "people" who posted originally on the other site did not know what metaphysical

means. Since we know you have one definition down, yet you actually came back and accused ME of not knowing. Where is this aggression coming from? I already posted the Oxford definition twice."

This 'aggression' is coming from the fact that you are attempting to sully the good name and intention of Metaphysics as it is more predominantly used, and classically studied, by shoving it into lump inclusion of your fantasy "arts" into the philosophy itself, or at least it's good name. At least, when you say "metaphysical arts", there is some degree of separation, however marginal, that makes it easier to digest. Calling your spookery Metaphysics is, however semantical, downright offensive. The original greek philosophers meant Metaphysics to be a discipline of seeking truth specifically for those things not physical in nature, and thus discernable and puzzled out only by the power of logic and reason alone. Your spookery has no connection whatsoever to the noble quest for truth about the actual composition, function, or nature of the universe or existence/reality. Such is comparable to equating sexual rape with romantic intimacy, because they both include several of the same physical motions and mechanisms; the spirit, the essence and intention of the words are as far from each other in original intent and meaning as the words rape and romantic intimacy. As Prophecy already very succinctly addressed, that you may take a poll and decide that such is appropriate hereabouts, or even as Kobok pointed out, that a book might be published coining the phrase involving the word Metaphysical, and that phrase (metaphysical arts) be taken up by the occultist community (Perhaps not because it is more accurate a descriptor at all, but a more publically inoffensive one compared to 'occult'), does not equate to the two very disparate meanings being shared or same. By any stretch.

As to the backtracking, you posted that "the person talking doesn't know what metaphysics means either." or something to that nature. Enchia directly followed with "Machinechimera you mean. Yes, I could kick him in the *#&@." You made no correction to him thereafter indicating that no, you did not mean me. So, according to the record you 'backtracked', on page one, it would seem to indicate by the heaviest of implications that you did in fact, express that I did not know what the term metaphysics meant.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 05:15:22 PM by MachineChimera » Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #73 on: July 13, 2006, 05:15:21 PM »

My intention... dont you mean OXFORD?

"Transcending physical matter... beyond physical"

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

yintwin

Settling In

*

Posts: 13

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #74 on: July 13, 2006, 10:33:39 PM »

I don't know if this will assist any in settling this argument, but in the section of David Morehouse's Remote Viewing Training Course entitled the physics of metaphysics(part 1) he defines metaphysics as "A division of philosophy that is concerned with the fundamental nature of reality and being. The study of metaphysics includes ontology(dealing with the nature of being, or reality-phenomenology); cosmology(the scientific study of the form, content, and origin of the physical universe); and often epistemology(the study of the sources, origins, nature, and limits of knowledge). If I am not mistaken, I believe that both of the views being presented in this argument would fall into this more complete definition of metaphysics. In both parts 1 and 2, Morehouse goes into depth about the nature of the metaphysical as he sees it, as well as its influence on the physical realm. I will likely present these arguments in the An Alternative explanation for psi (amongst other things) topic located in the main hall, pending I have time to either directly quote or paraphrase, which would each take a lengthy bit of time considering my poor typing speed, the size of the material, and the difficulty of explaining the concepts without the ability to post the visual aids alongside the text.

To any who remain skeptics of psionics, I suggest reading Psychic Warrior, Morehouse's autobiography. If the CIA believed in the psychic phenomena enough to fund a project for the purposes of collecting military intelligence, then I see no reasons why the nay Sayers can't. I know at this point I probably sound a lot like a promoter, but I assure you that I am not. I originally started unknowingly on the path of the metaphysical arts in a mere attempt to expand my consciousness. I had crude theories

that allowed for the possibilities of psionic abilities, but when I read the book, I was convinced that they(psionic abilities) were real and achievable by anyone. It's worth a look.

Logged

"Human salvation lies in the hands of the creatively maladjusted. "-Martin Luther King, Jr.

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6 7 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.75.html>

1 capture

13 May 2013

Apr MAY Jun

13

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

May 13, 2013, 03:09:17 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207641 Posts in 14761 Topics by 18447 Members - Latest Member: - PhilipFor Most online today: 78 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|+ The Auditorium

||+ Main Hall

||+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7 8 9 Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15190 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4747

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #75 on: July 13, 2006, 10:51:00 PM »

I thought we had concluded the definition debate? We all understand each other sufficiently to communicate now. I believe that is sufficient.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Which again, makes a case for how weak the field of parapsychology itself, is; it's more reputable proponents and practitioners do not even need a degree in the field within which they practice, in order to do so. Consider how many other fields of formal scientific research make such an allowance.

Nearly every interdisciplinary field does. Huge percentages, and often the majority of computational chemists, biophysicists, biochemists, computational neurobiologists, and so forth, are from a related area, because the granting of interdisciplinary degrees is rare. For the first 30 years or so of its existence, there were almost no computer science degrees. The majority of participants were mathematicians, engineers, physicists, or from other fields. This is not anomalous.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

This 'evidence' only further serves to solidify most skeptic considerations; most real phenomena are proven with evidence that is not subject to being read one way or another, and differing statistically from failure to 'success', dependant upon who is doing the data analysis.

Statistical analysis for psi experiments uses the same standardized techniques as are in common use in other fields. Ironically, parapsychology is the only field in which uneducated skeptics come along and presume those techniques "must be flawed" without even understanding the basic statistics. This is not a problem with the

statistical techniques, but with the preconceptions and lack of education of those who object to them.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Your comical condescending aside, taking a course on statistics does not implicate a change of heart at all in consideration for the data, as many in the scientific community, such as figures with masters degrees in mathematics (care to claim you're more familiar with statistical work than they are, by chance?)

Yes, I apparently am. I've taken courses on probability, statistics, research design, numerous other undergraduate and graduate level courses on mathematics, and I use probability and statistics on a regular basis in my research. In fact, if you wanted to spend the time, I could probably teach you the basics of statistics sufficient to understand and calculate the results and analyses used in standard psi experiments, but it would probably take quite some time and commitment on your part to learn the material.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

More to the point, if you attempt something enough times, it is -certain- you will have deviations from the statistical expected, 'chance' or average expected.

The exact value for how often something should happen is called an "expectation value", and tells you exactly how many occurrences you should expect given a probability and the number of times attempted. For the trivial case of a discrete event with a probability p of the event happening and r runs, the expectation value $\langle E \rangle$ is simply $p \cdot r$. So in essence, the probability of an event and the number of runs literally tell you the average number of events you should expect by chance.

What's more, not only can you calculate the expectation value, but you can also calculate the distribution of results of you were to do r runs an infinite number of times. Depending on the situation or setup, this is usually either a Poisson distribution, as in the above case of a rare event, or a normal distribution (aka Gaussian distribution) in the case of a uniformly distributed event, like the average of a random number generator choosing between 0 or 1.

In the case of both of these distributions, the width of those distributions grows narrower and narrower as N (or r , the number of runs) gets higher (this is the width relative to the expectation value in the case of the poisson distribution, which approaches the gaussian in shape as N increases), which means that the distributions become more centered around the expectation value. This means that not only do you have the estimate of the expectation value, but the more runs you do, the closer your actual value will be to that expectation value. As N gets very large, the odds of even a small deviation from that expectation value become astronomically small.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

In the faraday isolated RNG, did they dim the lights and put ping-pong ball halves over

the subjects' eyes?

Frequently. The ganzfeld approach has become quite prominent in the last 20 years.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM
Or have them stare directly at the machine?

Sometimes, but rarely. While I have heard of this being done, usually more isolation is preferred.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM
Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?

Yes, in nearly every experiment. This is how the control run is usually done, to make sure the results are actually intent dependent. This is core to the basic approach used in almost every experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM
How long did the run the RNG out in tests WITHOUT any subjects present at all, to get baseline deviations, to compare to what statistical calculations indicate the deviations should be?

Usually this is for the exact same length of time as the experimental run. Whenever possible, it is best to keep things exactly the same for the control run as for the experimental run, with the only thing varying being the variable of interest, in this case, the instruction for the participant to exert intent to make the desired change. And this is how it is usually done.

In a few cases I've heard of experiments in which much more lengthy control runs were also done to check the equipment thoroughly before and after the experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM
Psychics are not running around claiming to be able to predict what random numbers will be in an RNG in advance. They are claiming to move macro-scale/non-atomic sized objects with their minds, know events happening in different places, or in the future, or to be able to read other's thoughts. None of these RNG tests address or test those claims, and again, for the reason that all such claim testing will fail in a laboratory setting for solid evidence.

I have a more simple question for you... What reporting of this would you accept? "I saw him move the paperclip. Then he moved it again"? That's not what scientific papers look like, so they take more rigorous measurements when attempting to assess things more carefully, and this means using isolated RNGs.

You tell me specifically what reporting of the motion of a paperclip in a scientific journal you would accept. If you have no answer, then you are not being honest with us or yourself.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

You seem to feel somehow that Blackmore's research and expert opinion are somehow marred by her previous involvement with drug use in her younger years. I'm rather confident that you will not, in turn, make the same implication about Aleister Crowley and his contributions to occultism. I wonder why that is.

It's not Blackmore's drug use in her younger years, it's her continued and ongoing focus on drug use, and the fact that her own drug induced states of consciousness are more interesting to her than reality. This is not the making of a critical or objective scientist. If you think it is, you should reassess your judgment.

As for A. Crowley, I already told you that Crowley is of no significant interest to me. I do not approve of most of his ethics, personal choices, and so forth, nor do I find his opinions on the occult to be particularly relevant to my practice of psi. I'm sorry if that inconveniences you, but not everyone interested in something you don't believe in can be categorized into the same group.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

You pointed me to an excellent source of supportive propaganda for the occult/parapsychological belief in psychic abilities, and a source which has been heavily criticized by many well educated professionals in turn.

Have you, by any chance, READ The Conscious Universe? Here's one chapter from his book called The Field Guide to Skepticism. Please read it so that you have a better idea of the mindset of the man you are rebuking.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

A source that was written by a man that cannot even explain the meaning of the data patterns he evidently seeks to use as proof for his claims in said book, and answers inquiries about same to the nature of "I don't know" repeatedly. Awesome, solid groundwork you're providing in support, on that note. "I don't know" is always a "conclusive", "overwhelming", "astronomical" amount of inspiration to ME personally when it comes to assuring the validity of research (Try not to slip in that sarcasm).

"I don't know" was the correct answer to the question he was asked. He was NOT asked a question about conventional psi experiments. He was asked a question about a single recent preliminary test of a new design, for which results are NOT yet conclusive, and further investigation is still ongoing. Thus, when he says "I don't know", that is in fact, honesty. He does not know what it is yet, and thus, when asked what it is, he says he does not know. That is the mark of a good and objective scientist. Ridiculing him for that is naive.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

What is surprising is your continued assertion that "EVERY FIELD" keeps their data exclusively to their own field's journals, when many popular publications exist, like the New Scientist mentioned earlier.

Since that's the second time you referenced "New Scientist" as some absolute authority on scientific truth, allow me to clarify something for you... New Scientist, despite the second word in the name, is NOT a scientific journal. It is a MAGAZINE for laymen. It has no peer review, and thus, does not contain peer reviewed journal articles. Of the many physicists I know, I cannot think of one who even reads New Scientist.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

18/25 would be astonishing, if it were predicted or claimed (as would evidence an INTENT or conscious involvement with the results, and a connection between the individual receiving them.) before the results occurred.

It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent".

If you are thinking anything other than this about the human performance of psi, then you are misunderstanding what psi is.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

No event is technically dictated by chance, but in fact is deterministic in design.

Wrong wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton.

And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Which is, again, not a constantly repeated formula: those same individuals that got that 4% difference you're so fond of, did not repeat and get the same, or very similar, results every time, or even consistently.

Actually, yes they have. The only requirement is that people must be given time to rest between sessions, since of course, continually exerting intent can be somewhat tiring. But provided breaks are given, results ARE indeed repeatable, and have been consistently repeatable for most of the 20th and 21st century.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

oh, I get it! Psychic powers are things that do not function at the intention of the bearer of ability, but rather only as expressed over a period of attempts, in a situation where opposing factors are at work!

Close. Psi ability is a function of BOTH the intention of the bearer of the ability AND opposing factors (including distraction, lack of clarity in intent, doubt, etc). It is NOT easy to focus ones intent sufficiently to achieve good results.

Why you presume it would be easy to do something that you don't believe is possible is beyond me.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

That is, again, your convenient viewpoint. I'll note that Utts has not challenged his fault-finding with her evidence in that article to date

Okay. And I'll note that you're wrong. Her website does rebut his claims:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/response.html>

More mathematical detail is available here:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/air2.html>

In addition, Radin, in the book you neglected to read, addresses some of the other errors and omissions in the Hyman article you pointed to.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Quote

"Yes, I've read this before. This man does not even understand the scientific method, which is understandable because this is not usually covered in a study of either mathematics OR philosophy. Radin makes a specific hypothesis beforehand, and then tests it after looking at the data. This man criticizes Radin for not examining all possible hypotheses after seeing which ones might fit with the data. If Claus Larsen knew anything at all about science or statistics, he would immediately know that his suggestion is lunacy, and would cause false positives in any data set. We call this "massaging the data" where I come from. Radin's method, however, is a correct application of the scientific method, as his hypothesis is generated, specified, and then examined using the data set. Because he makes singular hypotheses, he is able to generate a rigorous probability for obtaining those results by chance.

Larsen's proposal would make this impossible, and thus is nonscientific."

Of course he doesn't understand the scientific method. What would an individual under contract with the Consortium of Math and Science know about the scientific method?

Rather, you suppose he does not, because he doesn't come to the same conclusion and appreciation of Radin's data and methodologies.

Actually, I conclude that he doesn't understand the scientific method because I can read, and I do understand the scientific method. Combining these two skills, it is quite simple to deduce that he does not. I don't expect you to believe this, as you arrived at this board with the preconclusion that everyone on it will not understand science. But since the only way around this is to discuss specific claims, and as you only made one specific claim, quoted below, I will address that:

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

So he has data that does not fit his hypothesis, but is ignoring the parts that don't fit, and trying to focus on the parts that do.

Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

One major claim? Really? I've -never- in all my reading of paranormal claims, come across a psychic that claimed to have the ability to alter probability.

Well, read more.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Telekinesis, maybe, as to altering how dice end up settling when they're rolled, or other such feats where a force being expressed might alter the outcome of things dependant upon kinetic forces at work themselves, but never the ability to alter the behavior of random chance or probability.

When a division is made, psychokinesis is usually divided into two categories: Macro-psychokinesis and micro-psychokinesis. Micro-psychokinesis is considered to be the alteration of probability or the shifting of a statistical event. A dice experiment is usually not considered to be a force acting on the die, but instead, a direct action on the probability of that die. It has been shown in a number of studies that the ability to affect probability does not depend on the complexity of the system involved, and thus, is not mediated by a force affecting the object, but by direct action on probability.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 11:02:41 PM by kobok » Logged

Enchia

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 875

Karma: 19

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #76 on: July 14, 2006, 01:45:48 AM »

I did not read anything on this topic and perhaps it is mentioned before;

In the human mind there is something called the principle of "The thinker and the prover". What the thinker thinks the prover proves". Machinechimera your thinker has been altered by science so what cannot be proven or is unlogical by science is not real and so your prover will alter all your paranormal perceptions to make it seem like untrue or the prover will give it an other cause.

If you were planning to use it against us then remember that what we are doing really manifests and not just look like if it happens. If one lights a candle using willpower the thinker can think what he wants and the prover can alter the perception as he likes but if a candle lights it lights. If one moves a chair across the room using telekinesis then again the thinker can think that it is not true and the prover will try to alter the perception but if the chair moves it just moves.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 04:17:14 AM by Enchia » Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #77 on: July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM »

Quote

"Nearly every interdisciplinary field does. Huge percentages, and often the majority of computational chemists, biophysicists, biochemists, computational neurobiologists, and so forth, are from a related area, because the granting of interdisciplinary degrees is rare. For the first 30 years or so of its existence, there were almost no computer science degrees. The majority of participants were mathematicians, engineers, physicists, or from other fields. This is not anomalous."

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to

study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

Quote

"Statistical analysis for psi experiments uses the same standardized techniques as are in common use in other fields. Ironically, parapsychology is the only field in which uneducated skeptics come along and presume those techniques "must be flawed" without even understanding the basic statistics. This is not a problem with the statistical techniques, but with the preconceptions and lack of education of those who object to them."

The same standardized techniques commonly used in other fields, and yet after all this time, none of these techniques have yielded solid, inarguable, or even obvious, proof of authenticity? I don't think uneducated skeptics are claiming those same techniques are flawed, but rather that the assumptive apophenial testers and believers look at the data produced by such tests and see concrete evidence where there is none. As you stated, the techniques are in common use in other fields that yield results by these test methods, that are concrete and self-evident, not subject to personal opinion as to validity or not. Once more, we come full circle to that individuals with more training in statistics and mathematics in general arrive at different conclusions than you do, seeing the same data, and your explanation is that they do not understand what they're looking at, or mathematics/statistics themselves. That's an awfully presumptuous, and not at all scientific, way of looking at things. "If you agree with me, you understand statistics. If you do not, you need more education." I'll reiterate also that if the results were 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', and 'astronomical' as you earlier described, there wouldn't be all this debate; the evidence would be self-supportive, not subject to numerous qualified ridicules.

Quote

"Yes, I apparently am. I've taken courses on probability, statistics, research design, numerous other undergraduate and graduate level courses on mathematics, and I use probability and statistics on a regular basis in my research. In fact, if you wanted to spend the time, I could probably teach you the basics of statistics sufficient to understand and calculate the results and analyses used in standard psi experiments, but it would probably take quite some time and commitment on your part to learn the material."

Once more, you have the same experience with a few statistics classes, and courses on mathematics, or less, than many of the individuals ridiculing the significance or meaning of the results you cite as successes, yet somehow feel qualified to make judgment that those of disparate opinion are not educated enough, whereas from the same level of education, or less, you somehow were educated enough. Such probably stems from your own belief as to your own intellectual accuity.

Quote

"The exact value for how often something should happen is called an "expectation value", and tells you exactly how many occurrences you should expect given a probability and the number of times attempted. For the trivial case of a discrete event with a probability p of the event happening and r runs, the expectation value $\langle E \rangle$ is simply $p \cdot r$. So in essence, the probability of an event and the number of runs literally tell you the average number of events you should expect by chance.

What's more, not only can you calculate the expectation value, but you can also calculate the distribution of results of you were to do r runs an infinite number of times. Depending on the situation or setup, this is usually either a Poisson distribution, as in the above case of a rare event, or a normal distribution (aka Gaussian distribution) in the case of a uniformly distributed event, like the average of a random number generator choosing between 0 or 1.

In the case of both of these distributions, the width of those distributions grows narrower and narrower as N (or r , the number of runs) gets higher (this is the width relative to the expectation value in the case of the poisson distribution, which approaches the gaussian in shape as N increases), which means that the distributions become more centered around the expectation value. This means that not only do you have the estimate of the expectation value, but the more runs you do, the closer your actual value will be to that expectation value. As N gets very large, the odds of even a small deviation from that expectation value become astronomically small."

Indeed, and yet these deviations from the expectation of value, however astronomically small, do occur, and with great frequency, if we again look to Littlewood's Law. As such, you are not at liberty to point to such an 'astronomically small' chance actually coming to fruition as evidence of a cause for a phenomena that already has explainable causes, unless you can somehow show evidence that the activity you are claiming was the reason such a deviation occurred. That would be valid. You are instead attempting to assert that the deviation's occurrence is proof of the phenomena, which is rather backward. How about you get evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence.

If a subject's active participation were required to effect such changes, that might make the results more consequential, but it's already been demonstrated that such is not even necessary. The deviations occur without focus, concentration, or intent. Indeed, it appears merely having somebody be involved with the RNG creates such deviations. And not all the time; indeed, the majority of the time, evidently, there is no measure of success above the statistically expressed expected. Also, repeatability does not mean it happens more than once. Repeatability means consecutively, or even better, Every time, to some degree. Please do show me an instance where ANY individual displays, in every interaction with an RNG, above-chance expected values.

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

In the faraday isolated RNG, did they dim the lights and put ping-pong ball halves over the subjects' eyes?

Frequently. The ganzfeld approach has become quite prominent in the last 20 years."

Mm. What's also been quite prominent is that, again, all that hooplah and serious treatment isn't even required; people can be reading magazines, daydreaming, lost in thought, and not at all concentrating or intent upon creating an effect at all, and they continue to happen, when they infrequently do. Obviously, no psychic intent or ability is required for these changes, since they sometimes occur in their absence as easily as in their supposed presence. So what we have here is an arguable 'evidence' of a deviation from chance, that is as much associable to the focus of a psychic working some mumbojumbo power over the outcome, as any other preposterous claim: I could say with a much, and as little, proof of connection between the results and any other idea, that same idea is responsible. I could say that the subjects' color of clothing is causing the deviations, or their choice of shoes, or their hair or eye color, and make the same evidence after reanalysis of successful results: People with green eyes were more capable of influencing the number of 1's produced than people with other, or that brunettes had more success influencing the RNG than blondes or redheads. It would be equally as erroneous; you are not at liberty to conjure from an occurrence, the reasons behind it, and state them as fact. You are required to demonstrate evidence of support for your suggested reason behind the occurrence, itself... not to apply the outcome of a test as proof an untested "cause." Testing a person's influence on an RNG is not a test of psychic ability. Perhaps testing a person's active, conscious attempt to influence the results, might be a test of psi on an RNG. But again, successful results are demonstrable without any intent to influence the results at all, so obviously intent or focus/conscious effort is not required. That rather invalidates the suggestion that psychic powers are at work, itself.

Quote

"Yes, in nearly every experiment. This is how the control run is usually done, to make sure the results are actually intent dependent. This is core to the basic approach used in almost every experiment."

Wrong, wrong, wrong, in your later words. They've indicated several times that conscious effort and focus is not required. Again, successes gleaned with subjects reading magazines or books, daydreaming, or doing some other activity. It's precisely this sort've shoe-horning that Radin was accused of, in his use of data to back his otherwise unfounded claims in the Conscious Universe, for which he repeatedly claimed "I don't know." I'll address that lower however.

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Psychics are not running around claiming to be able to predict what random numbers

will be in an RNG in advance. They are claiming to move macro-scale/non-atomic sized objects with their minds, know events happening in different places, or in the future, or to be able to read other's thoughts. None of these RNG tests address or test those claims, and again, for the reason that all such claim testing will fail in a laboratory setting for solid evidence."

I have a more simple question for you... What reporting of this would you accept? "I saw him move the paperclip. Then he moved it again"? That's not what scientific papers look like, so they take more rigorous measurements when attempting to assess things more carefully, and this means using isolated RNGs.

You tell me specifically what reporting of the motion of a paperclip in a scientific journal you would accept. If you have no answer, then you are not being honest with us or yourself."

Reporting that actually has to do with the body of psychic claims in existence. If someone claims to be able to move things with their mind, they should be able to back that with a test actually related to the idea. If scientists and skeptics can set up a control area to assure no cheating/fraudulent use of tricks are in use, and the subject can be demonstrated to move the objects without actually touching them with his body, then that would obviously be a supporting claim. Further, for his claim to be valid, it has to be demonstrated that the paperclip never moves in the way his 'successes' do, without him being present for it, or without someone actually trying to move the object with their mind. Scientists could easily draw up the research and supporting material of people on hand, witnessing the motion, and involve cameras and slow-motion footage to further support the witnesses, that no fraud can have been found to be involved with the results, and that the paperclip in question did, in fact, move when the subject concentrated to do as he claimed he could. The same for clairvoyance, or any other cognitive ability, or the ability to 'know the future.' State a specific claim, something that obviously cannot be applied to any other instances, and be able to repeat similar accuracy as to predictions. That also could be documented and subject to control methods. Easily. Or any other number of such for the bogus claims floating around such sites, about magickal powers of summoning, conjuration, or energy manipulation, or constructs (*choke.*). I'm reminded certain humorous 'radki' videos, where people claim to be capable of producing physical chi effects or some such nonsense, and the way nothing happened. People claiming their teachers to be 'sensei shadow', among other laughables. I also like the degree of disdain that people here express for such things as radki, when their own claims of psychic powers or magickal feats are as unproven and as illogically based as radki.

Quote

"It's not Blackmore's drug use in her younger years, it's her continued and ongoing focus on drug use, and the fact that her own drug induced states of consciousness are more interesting to her than reality. This is not the making of a critical or objective scientist. If you think it is, you should reassess your judgment."

Primarily, even if she does continue to use drugs, so long as she does not pollute her scientific assertions by some incorrect involvement of them or their effects in arriving at her assertions, it's of no consequence. That notwithstanding, drug use has often been used by occult figures as well, for the 'mentally liberating' effects it has. Evidently sensory deprivation, limitation, and meditation are all valid means of altering the consciousness in order to produce paranormal activity, but the altered state of consciousness coming from her choice of venue is not. Again, I find that a convenient resource of implication, when you've made no distinction whatsoever as to what altered states are valid supports to psi abilities, and which are of no consequence, and neither have backed such a statement as to what are valid means to arriving at them. This, much like so called 'psychics' on such sites as these, ridiculing "radki", and then turning around and claiming to be able to influence the weather, summon spirits (which themselves, have not been proven, etc, etc.), imbue the semblance of life into constructs, or to harm others physically or mentally by the powah of the TErribl3f3AR mind... strike me as a repeated, ridiculous pattern of people making irrational claims, and then ridiculing other equally irrational claims, or trying to argue logically about the behavior of their so called psychic powers.

Quote

"As for A. Crowley, I already told you that Crowley is of no significant interest to me. I do not approve of most of his ethics, personal choices, and so forth, nor do I find his opinions on the occult to be particularly relevant to my practice of psi. I'm sorry if that inconveniences you, but not everyone interested in something you don't believe in can be categorized into the same group."

Again, you tip-toe very smoothly around the issue of an important Occult figure, careful not to offend others here that DO believe in Crowley's work or opinions on the subject. I'll again assert that you should demonstrate then another prominent figure in the occult, that does have relevance to your practice of Psi.

Quote

"Have you, by any chance, READ The Conscious Universe? Here's one chapter from his book called The Field Guide to Skepticism. Please read it so that you have a better idea of the mindset of the man you are rebuking."

I have indeed read it, and find it riddled with the same manner of assertions he is leveling towards detractors in the self-same chapter. He states "wrong" as to the statement that "Despite the endless pronouncements and anecdotes in the popular press, and despite a steady trickle of serious research on such things, there is no significant or trustworthy evidence that such phenomena even exist. The wide gap between popular conviction on this matter, and the actual evidence, is something that itself calls for research. For there is not a single parapsychological effect that can be repeatedly or reliably produced in any laboratory suitably equipped to perform and control the experiment. Not one.", yet makes no backing of it by providing a case list of all the supposedly repeated, reliably produced effects in a suitably equipped and controlled library. If there are 'half a dozen' psi effects as he claims that have met such

a standard, he ought to very easily list them, as they seem evidently to be directly and specifically upon his mind at the time, to come up with such an estimation. He continues to claim that evidence has been provided that did meet the standards, and was measured success, as though it were fact, when in fact the very claims he's discussing are -still- to this day being met with credible doubt and naysaying. He simply, as you do, look aside from logical faults found in such experiments, which have ranged from lack of proper control in the test environment (9 of the 28 test studies, and the largest group of 'successes' in them to be applied to the overall study of deviation by "4%" from the expected, came from the same laboratory, and the subjects testing were known/familiar to the lab techs, for instance.), to data leakage, and so on. There has not been to present ONE repeatable test outcome indicative of something psi related going on that cannot be, using the same data coallated, be shown to be a marginal success, or no success at all, dependant upon who's reviewing the data, and by what criteria they're using. Hardly convincing 'evidence' at all. I'm hard pressed to think of any modern day physically manifesting phenomena that exists at all that had evidence of it's existance hotly contested for so long a period of time, that has actually been proven to be existant. Yet another exception to the norm, which psi-proponents would have reasonable individuals swallow. He makes such statements as "As we've seen, the meta-analyses described earlier have shown that design flaws cannot account for the cumulative success rates in psi experiments", when further meta-analyses have indeed shown just that. Only that when it happens, proponents like yourself attempt to dispel such by stating the reviewer clearly doesn't understand statistics, or somesuch. I'll also note that he attempts the following "After a hundred years and thousands of experiments, there are still vigorous controversies over such elementary phenomena as conscious awareness, memory, learning, and perception. " when his examples are, unlike psi, all things dealing with ephemeral issues, not physically manifested phenomena such as many psi claims are.

Also, as to Radin, enjoy this link. <http://www.csicop.org/sb/2002-12/reality-check.html> Wherein a PROFESSOR of statistics, who of a certainty is better trained, and more proficient with judging both the merit of statistical data, and it's meaning, says this. "In his review of Radin's book for the journal Nature, statistics professor I.J. Good disputes this calculation, calling it "a gross overestimate." He estimates that the number of unpublished, unsuccessful reports needed to account for the results by the file drawer effect should be reduced to fifteen or less. How could two meta-analyses result in such a wide discrepancy? Somebody is doing something wrong, and in this case it is clearly Radin. He has not performed the file-drawer analysis correctly."

We have also "Douglas Stokes is a specialist in statistical analysis who is very sympathetic to the psi movement. In his book *The Nature of Mind*, Stokes considers the wide range of reports of psychic phenomena, from the anecdotal to the experimental. Although he concludes that psi has not been scientifically demonstrated, he still wants to believe in it based on the "compelling stories" he has heard and his own personal "spontaneous psi experiences." Nevertheless, in an article published in *Skeptical Inquirer* (25[3], May/June 2001, 22-25), Stokes describes the fundamental errors that Radin and others have made in their calculations. ""

You'll note that the author of the article linked, mentioning all these things, is professor emeritus of physics and astronomy, similarly better educated than you we can be sure, and similarly criticizing both the validity, and the methods of data collection, as far as Radin goes. So we have extremely well educated statisticians coming out left and right, finding Radin's claims flawed. Your attempt to belittle the nay-saying rebuttals by claiming they 'don't understand statistics', is obviously a dead duck. People that understand and practice statistics far better than you, for example, and for a living, which you do not, fail to see your 'successes' too. Obviously, failing to find Radin's or Utts' conclusions meaningful has nothing to do with a lack of understanding of statistics or scientific method, but rather who's looking at the data. "Conclusive", "astronomical", "overwhelming" proof indeed.

As to the validity of Dean Radin writing on skepticism at all, or attempting to lay the ground work for what would be valid skepticism as to his work, we'll consider the following. "That didn't sound too skeptical to me, so I investigated further and found that Dean Radin is listed as one of the Associates and Advisors for these genuine skeptics, along with Larry Dossey (who has scientific proof that prayer heals), Gary Schwartz (who has scientific proof that John Edward gets messages from the dead), and Rupert Sheldrake (who has scientific proof that people know when they're being stared at and that some pets are psychic). (The site is registered to Dr. Sheldrake who seems to have discovered an interesting way to deal with critics.) These and other like-minded genuine skeptics say that in addition to promoting genuine skepticism their purpose "includes an open-minded investigation of unexplained phenomena, a questioning of dogmatic assumptions, and a skeptical examination of the claims of self-proclaimed skeptics." They even list a dead man as one of their advisers (Marcello Truzzi). No one can say they aren't an open-minded sort of group."

"They even have a Field Guide to Skepticism, which consists of a defense of Radin and an attack on his skeptical critics. There is also a page called A Who's Who of Media Skeptics - Skeptics or Dogmatists? The first on the list is Susan Blackmore. I was tempted to write Dr. Sheldrake and inform him that her latest book isn't the one on memes but is on consciousness. I'd like to ask him about Radin's claim that "the nature of human consciousness" has been a "taboo topic." I'll bet that's news to Dr. Blackmore. I know it was to me."

"I have read large chunks of Dossey, Schwartz, and Radin, and the only thing they are skeptical of is skepticism. "

"Radin claims there are thousands of experiments that prove psi exists. But the truth is that there are many psi experiments that have found interesting statistical data. He calls these anomalies. They aren't anomalies. The discovery that the statistical data for a random number generator is not likely due to chance is not the discovery of an anomaly in the same sense that the discovery of X-rays was an anomaly. Finding a statistic that is not likely due to chance is not an anomaly. It is an indication that some kind of causal event is most likely occurring. There is no justification for assuming a law of nature or a

basic scientific theory has been violated when an odd statistic is discovered. Yet, Radin and some of his fellow psi researchers treat any statistically significant result in a psi experiment as proof not only that psi exists but as proof that the fundamental assumptions of natural science (materialism and determinism) must be abandoned."

I could go on, but believe this sufficient for now.

Quote

"I don't know" was the correct answer to the question he was asked. He was NOT asked a question about conventional psi experiments. He was asked a question about a single recent preliminary test of a new design, for which results are NOT yet conclusive, and further investigation is still ongoing. Thus, when he says "I don't know", that is in fact, honesty. He does not know what it is yet, and thus, when asked what it is, he says he does not know. That is the mark of a good and objective scientist. Ridiculing him for that is naive."

That it was the correct and honest answer, we will agree upon. Shoehorning his data however, was not. I wasn't aware that fitting pieces data that seem to support one's claim, and ignoring the relevance or meaning of other data that doesn't support the claim, had become good and objective scientific work. Ridiculing him in that pursuit is however, entirely not naive. It is, in your own words, correct and honest. That's about the equivalent of me stating that it rains because the sun is up, and affects the clouds. I could point to the times when the sun was prevailing, and it rained, and say "See! I told you!" And then, when it rains at night and the sun isn't reigning, answer "Why did it rain just now, then?" with "I don't know." Just like Radin did. It would be the same manner of shoehorning data. Ridiculous.

Quote

"Since that's the second time you referenced "New Scientist" as some absolute authority on scientific truth, allow me to clarify something for you... New Scientist, despite the second word in the name, is NOT a scientific journal. It is a MAGAZINE for laymen. It has no peer review, and thus, does not contain peer reviewed journal articles. Of the many physicists I know, I cannot think of one who even reads New Scientist."

I did not reference it at all as some absolute authority about scientific truth. It is however a scientific publication. As to your attempt to implicate it's obscurity, it has well over 680,000 subscribers, is the 40th in the list of most-linked-to news organisations and the only science and technology specialist in the top 100, and "is not a peer-reviewed scientific journal, but it is widely read by both nonscientists and scientists."

Quote

"It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply

went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent".

No, a specific claim is not made. "I will now affect the number of 1's produced by this randomly generating machine." is not a specific claim. It does not at all denote in what manner the subject plans to affect the machine, or in what way. If a baseball hitter claims "I can hit 20 home runs out of 100 pitches", that is a specific claim. If he claims "I've a real talent for hitting home runs", and then demonstrates no talent immediately for such, and indeed scores only, say, 4% more homeruns over the course of his career than the average ballplayer does, he will not be remembered in history, or said to be, a homerun hitter with talent. He will, at best, be said to be someone that hit more home runs than the usual guy, which is essentially what is being said by Utts and Radin, as far as the RNG's go. Though, as I've above indicated, even those 'successes' are under fire as to their validity or honesty at all.

Quote

"Wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton. And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades."

Arguably, and arguably not, depending upon which side of the fence you're on. Einstein and Bohm for instance, were hidden variables determinists, and they are not alone. To this day, many physicists side with the Bohm interpretation of QM/Bohmian mechanics. Gerard Hooft indeed published in 1999 Quantum Gravity as a Dissipative Deterministic System, pointing out flaws in the present model of non-determinist quantum mechanics. Once more, your belief system and opinion on results, do not make them factual.

Quote

"Actually, yes they have. The only requirement is that people must be given time to rest between sessions, since of course, continually exerting intent can be somewhat tiring. But provided breaks are given, results ARE indeed repeatable, and have been consistently repeatable for most of the 20th and 21st century."

Oh yeah? So, every time these people are tested with the RNG in the same environment, they yield results about or around 4% away from the normal expected, every time the test is run? I linked earlier to where the test result successes in fact couldn't be reproduced on a different RNG, even when the PEAR group coordinated with german scientists. That's not exactly repeatable sounding to me.

Quote

"Close. Psi ability is a function of BOTH the intention of the bearer of the ability AND opposing factors (including distraction, lack of clarity in intent, doubt, etc). It is NOT

easy to focus ones intent sufficiently to achieve good results.

Why you presume it would be easy to do something that you don't believe is possible is beyond me."

What is beyond -me- is that you continue to refer to such weak, indeed fiercely attacked claims of successful results as evidence of the existence of something that, by all rights, and with all manner of claims much LARGER and more powerful/obvious in effect than on a micro scale, none of which have been demonstrated themselves. I do not believe it should be easy to produce a difficult result. I believe it should be easy to produce a difficult result conclusively, in hundreds of years of claims, or at least in the most recent 5 decades. I believe that with all these claims on this website, and many others in the parapsychological community about weather-control, summoning spirits, telekinetic energies, elemental manipulation, telepathy, psychic visions of the future, chi force useful on a physical scale to an extent as to actually be applicable to a fight, and so on running rampant, that at least ONE person with such abilities could step forward and produce them in a way more powerful and obvious than a statistical percentage of deviation greater than what is expected to happen by sheer luck, if such abilities actually existed. That in the face of millions in rewards being offered, and revolution of history in return for such a display, none have actually stepped up and done so, you and others like you continue to believe and attempt to back such fantasy, is mind blowing.

Quote

"Okay. And I'll note that you're wrong. Her website does rebut his claims:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/response.html> More mathematical detail is available here: <http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/air2.html>

In addition, Radin, in the book you neglected to read, addresses some of the other errors and omissions in the Hyman article you pointed to."

They'll have a lot more rebuttals to make, as the links and quotes I've placed above well illustrate.. Perhaps they should be reviewing their own mathematical details, and doing so without predilection to look for indications of success while ignoring data that's non sequitor to their assertions.

Quote

"Actually, I conclude that he doesn't understand the scientific method because I can read, and I do understand the scientific method. Combining these two skills, it is quite simple to deduce that he does not. I don't expect you to believe this, as you arrived at this board with the preconclusion that everyone on it will not understand science. But since the

only way around this is to discuss specific claims, and as you only made one specific claim, quoted below, I will address that:"

Perhaps you should read, and review the scientific method, again, as, once more we see that very well educated, respectable members of their scientific communities are concurring with Larsen's viewpoint and criticisms, as to Radin and Utts' "evidence."

Quote

"Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that."

So far as his graphical data, and the book at large go, his hypothesis seems to be that when many people are focused on one thing, it influences stochastic processes. Done.

Quote

"One major claim? Really? I've -never- in all my reading of paranormal claims, come across a psychic that claimed to have the ability to alter probability."

"Well, read more."

I can read until the cows come home, but even if I do stumble across an account where a psychic is claiming the power to affect the outcome of probability-based events, it will be drown so far as the percentage of claims NOT based on such a thing. The most prevalent claims, and the ones most proven by polls as well heard of and familiar to the population in general, are clairvoyance, telepathy, telekinesis, and other such grand claims. Psychics, even historically, have not ran around claiming to be able to influence random number generations. They claim to know the future, or to bend bars or spoons, or move macro-scale objects, or to read thoughts, or to visit places out of their bodies. However you desire to take my meaning literally and out of context, as to implicate that such actually does exist as a major psychic claim, it will still be an erroneous assertion.

Quote

"When a division is made, psychokinesis is usually divided into two categories: Macro-psychokinesis and micro-psychokinesis. Micro-psychokinesis is considered to be the alteration of probability or the shifting of a statistical event. A dice experiment is usually not considered to be a force acting on the die, but instead, a direct action on the probability of that die. It has been shown in a number of studies that the ability to affect probability does not depend on the complexity of the system involved, and thus, is not mediated by a force affecting the object, but by direct action on probability."

Indeed. So where are the successful tests of Macro-scale psychokinesis? Where are the moving, non-debunked paperclips in controlled environments, or the rattling coke cans, or the levitating feathers or papers? Suspiciously absentee, along with all the majority of other, familiar psychic claims and magickal hoo-ha. Well, perhaps not so suspiciously after all, all things considered. But certainly absentee.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 11:33:13 AM by MachineChimera » Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #78 on: July 14, 2006, 11:58:33 AM »

The "occult" and "psychic phenomena" are not synonyms. One refers to something "obscure" such as your notion of spookery, while the other is more specific, which is not obscure at all. Crowley was a magician and drug addict; he was never the subject of any psychical experiments, nor has anything he claimed to do been tested in a lab.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #79 on: July 14, 2006, 12:28:10 PM »

Quote

"The "occult" and "psychic phenomena" are not synonyms. One refers to something "obscure" such as your notion of spookery, while the other is more specific, which is not obscure at all. Crowley was a magician and drug addict; he was never the subject of any psychical experiments, nor has anything he claimed to do been tested in a lab."

No, they are not synonyms. Psi abilities fall under the Occult umbrella, however, so to refer to psychic phenomena as matters of the occult is not inaccurate, but less specific. The occult in general however, is no more or less 'obscure' than Psi abilities.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #80 on: July 14, 2006, 12:29:55 PM »

They do not fall under the occult umbrella, because that umbrella and its constituents have nothing to do with the scientific investigations presented. Scientists are not interested in spells, or charms, or potions; they are interested in how the mind may affect what we percieve to be reality.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #81 on: July 14, 2006, 12:41:06 PM »

Well, if the Occult meant specifically "Charms, spells, potions" and so forth, that would be applicable. It does not, and so it isn't, respectively.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #82 on: July 14, 2006, 12:51:38 PM »

Well... the occult in any context does not embody or necessarily include psychic phenomena. By virtue of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure or secret.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Salubriion

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 64

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #83 on: July 14, 2006, 01:14:09 PM »

MachineChimera, I find your argument is degrading. Mostly because you seem to completely ignore/miss things when responding.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's

subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

He said interdisciplinary field. You should have at least gotten that from the examples he listed. Last time I checked, Physics wasn't an interdisciplinary field.

Or when you asked.

Quote

Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?

Even though when he explained in the experiment that he described that they measured the RNG when it was not being affected and came up with an average of .500000, there are other things, but you are more and more just simply ignoring/skipping important points.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 01:15:59 PM by Salubrion » Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #84 on: July 14, 2006, 02:09:14 PM »

Quote

Well... the occult in any context does not embody or necessarily include psychic phenomena. By virtue of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure or secret."- Solstice

Really? The occult doesn't by definition, cover psychic phenomena? You need to check the definition of occult again, boyo. And by 'virtue' of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure, or secret, in claim. Neither are occult acts: you'll find shows all over prime time tv regarding magic practicing witches, wizards on the big cinema screen, and all manner of other popular stories regarding all manner of aspects of the occult. If you think to make the so called 'Psi' realm seem somehow more credible in claiming it's more well known/less obscure, you're failing miserably. In fact, there are more shows on tv about Occult related shows NOT relating to psychic

abilities, than there are shows about psychics. It could be argued that popular culture is more familiar with the former, then with your psi arts.

Quote

"He said interdisciplinary field. You should have at least gotten that from the examples he listed. Last time I checked, Physics wasn't an interdisciplinary field.

Or when you asked.

"Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?"

Even though when he explained in the experiment that he described that they measured the RNG when it was not being affected and came up with an average of .500000, their are other things, but you are more and more just simply ignoring/skipping important points."

I'm not skipping or ignoring important points, I'm emphasizing that there are counterbalances to the points he claims, which he seems to be stating as though they are somehow overruling or of some greater importance. He ignores the instances where the very same conditions meet with failure, and tries to push into the light of discourse the 'evidence' of when conditions indicate some modicum of "success."

Also, we weren't talking about interdisciplinary fields, at first. That was his choice of wording, and it could as much be argued that physics is related to parapsychology, as that mathematics is related to physics. Yet, strangely, you do not need a mathematics degree to practice physics. You get a physics degree. So, unless there's some formal list of what are classified as 'interdisciplinary' fields, I expect that he was simply calling it such out of convenience, when in fact many fields contain elements of others, yet still the practitioners get primary degrees in the actual field itself.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 02:13:36 PM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Azazen

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 87

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #85 on: July 14, 2006, 03:25:18 PM »

You must not be able to comprehend what .500000 means. it means that if say 1,000,000 numbers were generated that there was -no- fluxuation and exactly 50% of the generated numbers were 1's and exactly 50% were 0's. The zero's added after the 5 mean something in case you didn't realize.

It also means that in the numbers generated while the person was trying to change the outcome that out of 1,000,000 numbers there were 20,000 fluxuations.

Hmm, that's odd... that's 2,000,000% more fluxuations than when there was no one concentraiting on the machine... but I'm sure we can write that off as mere coincidence.

And keep in mind this isn't an isolated incident like your example of babies being born. This is over a long period of time with someone working towards a specific goal, to produce one's instead of zero's. Which you can plainly see by simple math that while the subject was concentraiting there were more 1's than zero's, and not just a small percentage more, there were 2,000,000% more extra one's when the subject was concentraiting than there were extra one's when no one was concentraiting on the machine. Not a number you can ignore.

As for this experiment you keep referring to, it's commonly known that humans have an energy field -around- them that affect machines as well as other humans. Which would account for the fluxuations on your machine while people were in the room reading.

As already stated, in the experiment Kobok is referring to the subject and machine were in different rooms, if not seperate buildings.

One last time, for good referance, 2,000,000%.

Logged

What sane person could live in this world and not be crazy...

If we are able to step out of what we think is so "obviously" correct, we should.

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #86 on: July 14, 2006, 03:36:51 PM »

Quote

"You must not be able to comprehend what .500000 means. It means that if say 1,000,000 numbers were generated that there was -no- fluctuation and exactly 50% of the generated numbers were 1's and exactly 50% were 0's. The zero's added after the 5 mean something in case you didn't realize.

It also means that in the numbers generated while the person was trying to change the outcome that out of 1,000,000 numbers there were 20,000 fluctuations.

Hmm, that's odd... that's 2,000,000% more fluctuations than when there was no one concentrating on the machine... but I'm sure we can write that off as mere coincidence.

And keep in mind this isn't an isolated incident like your example of babies being born. This is over a long period of time with someone working towards a specific goal, to produce one's instead of zero's. Which you can plainly see by simple math that while the subject was concentrating there were more 1's than zero's, and not just a small percentage more, there were 2,000,000% more extra one's when the subject was concentrating than there were extra one's when no one was concentrating on the machine. Not a number you can ignore.

As for this experiment you keep referring to, it's commonly known that humans have an energy field -around- them that affect machines as well as other humans. Which would account for the fluctuations on your machine while people were in the room reading.

As already stated, in the experiment Kobok is referring to the subject and machine were in different rooms, if not separate buildings.

One last time, for good reference, 2,000,000%. "

What you don't seem to understand, is that the same experiment has been duplicated, and they got the same sort've 'significant' deviation from the expected chance when people weren't even paying attention. Reading a magazine or book. Daydreaming. No focus or intent whatsoever. Which is rather my point. If the same effect can be achieved in the same manner of 'success' as is being claimed in the experiment Kobok's referring to, then what's at work being the 'phenomena' has nothing to do with psionics or intention. Then again, most such experiments fail outright, so.

Really? So.. if people have energy fields (Yes, it's an electromagnetic field. Kthnx.) that cause this phenomena, then why do many, or MOST, of such tests fail, even when the subject is near the machine? If your conjecture were accurate, then the machine would deviate from the expected EVERY Time an individual were near the RNG. Also, not the case.

Also, it might be in your best interest to check your math. I'll point you to my latest

response to Kobok, reinforcing, and listing yet MORE individuals who are professional statisticians, extremely well educated people in the fields of mathematics, whom are evaluating the same data from the experiment in question, and are not finding a 2,000,000% increase in anything. Kobok mentioned a 4%, so how you got from 4% to 2 million percent more, I don't know. In any event, even Kobok's 4% claim does not hold up to these extremely well educated professionals' scrutiny or statistical review. One last time, for good reference. Cheesy

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 03:50:23 PM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Azazen

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 87

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #87 on: July 14, 2006, 07:10:23 PM »

I didn't think you would understand. It seems you are incapable of calculating that when something happens 20,000 times the second time and it happend 0 times the first time it is a two million percent increase. Let's break it down for the laymen in this thread (You). If something happens 0 times the first time and 1 time the second time it is a 100% increase. Now multiply that by 20,000. It's very obvious to me now, why you would say that the results are insignificant. All you seem to be able to say is "If it were relevant 'they' wouldn't say it isn't" They being scientists that claim to have looked over the data provided and come to a scientific conclusion.

"Oh no, the scientists of the world say it is flat, you must be an idiot for saying otherwise. Who are you to them anyway? Where are your degree's Christopher Columbus?! I don't have to check anything because those intelligent scientists told me so!"

That seems to be your argument, like a broken record you keep saying "If it were true the scientists wouldn't say it isn't!". Now that we have established that your math is not only flawed but you are unable to understand and calculate simple mathematical concepts I don't think you get to say what math is or isn't wrong here. You should accept what we say as truth without question. It seems to be what you've done with all of the sceptics, because we all know you're unable to calculate the results yourself.

Logged

What sane person could live in this world and not be crazy...

If we are able to step out of what we think is so "obviously" correct, we should.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4747

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #88 on: July 14, 2006, 09:12:05 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

For crying out loud, did you even read what I wrote before replying? Physics is not interdisciplinary. Computational chemistry, computational neurbiology, biochemistry, etc, and yes, parapsychology, are all interdisciplinary. Parapsychology is an interdisciplinary study between physics, psychology, and statistics. It draws elements, techniques, and researchers from each of these fields. I explained this to you already, but you seem bent on repeating your preconceptions without reading the text that I am typing.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

The same standardized techniques commonly used in other fields, and yet after all this time, none of these techniques have yielded solid, inarguable, or even obvious, proof of authenticity?

They have indeed yielded solid and obvious proof of the validity of psi. Unfortunately, nothing is inarguable. People argue because things make them unhappy.

Evolution, similarly, has solid and obvious proof of its validity to the same extent as psi. Yet still, you have around 50% of the U.S. believing evolution is bogus (particularly in your state), and you have creationists constantly making up crap about how the evolutionists are all just fraudulent, are all lying, or are just conducting bad science. You get popular creationist magazines which purport to point out flaws in standard results in evolution science (just like the popular skeptical magazines which do the same), and you get creationists who self-annoint themselves as experts on evolution without having ever actually DONE any work in the science of evolution, who go around telling people how bogus it is (just like the skeptics who self-annoint themselves as experts in parapsychology without ever doing any studies).

So sadly, nothing is inarguable. If your best reason for disbelieving the results of parapsychology is that people argue about it, then you are barking up quite a fallacious tree.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

I'll reiterate also that if the results were 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', and 'astronomical' as you earlier described, there wouldn't be all this debate; the evidence would be self-supportive, not subject to numerous qualified ridicules.

I certainly wish that were true. But sadly, humans aren't quite so rational. See above.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Once more, you have the same experience with a few statistics classes, and courses on mathematics, or less, than many of the individuals ridiculing the significance or meaning of the results you cite as successes, yet somehow feel qualified to make judgment that those of disparate opinion are not educated enough, whereas from the same level of education, or less, you somehow were educated enough. Such probably stems from your own belief as to your own intellectual accuity.

Well, you show me precisely what statistical conclusion I have made incorrectly. If you want to debate on a basis of intellectual ability and subject knowledge, we can certainly do so, but we shall do it with facts, not repeated rhetoric.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Indeed, and yet these deviations from the expectation of value, however astronomically small, do occur, and with great frequency, if we again look to Littlewood's Law.

You are grossly misapplying "Littlewood's Law". Littlewood's Law was based on the premise that in everyday events, the number of "runs" is astronomically high due to the huge variation in "things" that happen, so if you select "any astronomically unlikely event" from the set of all possible things that happen to a person, which is

astronomically high, then you will have these events happen on a somewhat regular basis.

What it DOES NOT mean is that astronomically unlikely events happen with more frequency than their probability. So when we have systems with known numbers of runs, astronomical deviations do NOT happen with great frequency.

Any attempt to use this to invalidate the results of controlled psi experiments is a fallacy and indicates a misunderstanding of basic statistics. You should be skeptical of any webpage you have read which uses this argument.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

As such, you are not at liberty to point to such an 'astronomically small' chance actually coming to fruition as evidence of a cause for a phenomena that already has explainable causes, unless you can somehow show evidence that the activity you are claiming was the reason such a deviation occurred. That would be valid. You are instead attempting to assert that the deviation's occurrence is proof of the phenomena, which is rather backward. How about you get evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence.

The controlled experiments DO provide evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence, and do NOT claim that the "presence" of a deviation is the source of this claim. Instead, the experiments rely on the standard and basic principle of "controlled experimentation", which is that if you only vary ONE variable between a control run and an experimental run, namely, the activity of the participant's focus, and there is a statistically significant deviation BETWEEN these two runs, then it indicates that the varied variable CAUSED that change.

This is the identical core principle upon which nearly every psychology and medical study in the last 100 years is based. If you don't believe it, then I'm afraid you don't believe in science.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

What's also been quite prominent is that, again, all that hooplah and serious treatment isn't even required; people can be reading magazines, daydreaming, lost in thought, and not at all concentrating or intent upon creating an effect at all, and they continue to happen, when they infrequently do. Obviously, no psychic intent or ability is required for these changes, since they sometimes occur in their absence as easily as in their supposed presence.

No. Again, that is not how controlled experiments are done.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

They've indicated several times that conscious effort and focus is not required.

Again, only one variable is varied, and that variable is the conscious effort. Therefore,

for significant change, it is the cause of the change. This is the basic premise of controlled research.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

I have indeed read it, and find it riddled with the same manner of assertions he is leveling towards detractors in the self-same chapter. He states "wrong" as to the statement that "Despite the endless pronouncements and anecdotes in the popular press, and despite a steady trickle of serious research on such things, there is no significant or trustworthy evidence that such phenomena even exist. The wide gap between popular conviction on this matter, and the actual evidence, is something that itself calls for research. For there is not a single parapsychological effect that can be repeatedly or reliably produced in any laboratory suitably equipped to perform and control the experiment. Not one.", yet makes no backing of it by providing a case list of all the supposedly repeated, reliably produced effects in a suitably equipped and controlled library. If there are 'half a dozen' psi effects as he claims that have met such a standard, he ought to very easily list them, as they seem evidently to be directly and specifically upon his mind at the time, to come up with such an estimation.

He DOES list them in excruciating detail. You read one chapter out of a fairly thick book, most of which is focused on detailing hundreds of studies, the details of their methodologies, the criticisms of those studies, and the replications of those studies, exactly as you say he should do.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

There has not been to present ONE repeatable test outcome indicative of something psi related going on that cannot be, using the same data coallated, be shown to be a marginal success, or no success at all, dependant upon who's reviewing the data, and by what criteria they're using.

Sure there has. The RNG influence experiments are consistent and are not even close to marginal significance. Their significance is quite astronomical. The Ganzfeld experiments are a sequence of experiments in which a single protocol was used to repeatedly test psi perception.

The only prevailing criticism against the Ganzfeld experiments is that, somehow, magically, there were hundreds or thousands of experiments that people did (no one knows who did them), and no one ever told anybody about, and that these experiments balance out the ones which are reported. If we approached medical studies with that kind of stubborn logic we'd be dying at 60.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent"."

No, a specific claim is not made. "I will now affect the number of 1's produced by this randomly generating machine." is not a specific claim. It does not at all denote in what manner the subject plans to affect the machine, or in what way.

Sure, "I will now affect the number of 1's produced" does not say what way, but that's not what I said. I said "try to get as many right as possible", which means, "I will now increase the number of 1's produced", which IS a specific AND testable claim. And the test is done correctly.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"Wrong wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton. And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades."

Arguably, and arguably not, depending upon which side of the fence you're on. Einstein and Bohm for instance, were hidden variables determinists, and they are not alone. To this day, many physicists side with the Bohm interpretation of QM/Bohmian mechanics. Gerard Hooft indeed published in 1999 Quantum Gravity as a Dissipative Deterministic System, pointing out flaws in the present model of non-determinist quantum mechanics. Once more, your belief system and opinion on results, do not make them factual.

His theory makes predictions which are unfortunately wrong. He predicts that there are massless deterministic neutrinos for which operators would remain diagonal. This was contradicted experimentally in 2001, when good measurements of neutrino mass were made, and solar neutrino mixing was measured.

His theory also makes an incorrect computability prediction about quantum versus classical computing, although to be fair, this was published prior to a large mass of papers about quantum computing which came out in the years between 1999 and 2006, so we have the benefit of hindsight on this.

Despite the incorrect predictions of the theory, the real clincher though is that Hooft fails to adequately explain the EPR experiments of the 80's, in which it was demonstrated that hidden variable theories are false. Hooft tries to explain this away by saying there might be some determinism at scales much much smaller than the electron, but that the determinism becomes non-deterministic at the scale of subatomic particles, and thus, explaining the EPR experiments. This fails on the basic definition of deterministic, and he does not demonstrate this except to say that no equation exists.

This is why Hooft's paper has not become accepted physics knowledge. And thus we are left with the conclusion that the universe is not deterministic, as it says in essentially every modern physics textbook which addresses the topic.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that."

So far as his graphical data, and the book at large go, his hypothesis seems to be that when many people are focused on one thing, it influences stochastic processes. Done.

Not quite. That is a generalization of his hypothesis. The hypothesis for an experiment must be specific, and his were. For two experiments of this type that I have data sitting in front of me for, the 1995 Academy Awards experiment had a hypothesis that measurements of order in isolated random number generators would be significantly higher during pre-marked time periods of high interest (such as when awards were announced) than during per-marked time periods of low interest (such as when commercials were on). This succeeded with odds of several hundred to one.

For the O.J. Simpson Verdict, the hypothesis was, and I quote, "We expected that the unusual degree of mass attention focused on this event would cause the combined output of five independent RNGs simultaneously to show unexpected order when the verdict was announced." This also succeeded with odds of several hundred to one. It is indeed true that at the very start of the O.J. Simpson Verdict preshow broadcast, the order also rose very high, but this was outside of the initial hypothesis.

Since you slipped in "the book at large" into your previous comment, I deduce that you misunderstand the content of "The Conscious Universe". The particular experiments in question which we are discussing are called "Field Consciousness" experiments (although they may be renamed at some point in the next decade or so as research continues and understanding increases, since they are fairly new). And it should be noted that this type of experiment only occupies 1 chapter out of 17 chapters of The Conscious Universe (or 18 out of 362 pages), because the focus of the book is not supposed to be on this type of experiment. It is supposed to be an overview of all existing parapsychology work prior to the publication date of 1997. The field consciousness studies are simply included as an example of recent results which are intriguing but not thoroughly understood. If some reviewer presented them to you as representative of the contents of that book, then that reviewer misled you, as one could note by opening the book at least as far as the table of contents.

You may notice that I neglected to respond to some portions of your previous posts. I provide you with a statement from a statistics professor who specializes in research design, you provide me with a statement from a guy who got a masters in mathematics.

I provide you with a Nobel laureate in physics, you provide me with a retired astrophysicist. We could go back and forth with argument from authority for quite some time, and it would remain as fallacious as the day we start. I think it is far more prudent to discuss experimental fact if your wish is also to discern the truth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 03:36:51 PM

What you don't seem to understand, is that the same experiment has been duplicated, and they got the same sort've 'significant' deviation from the expected chance when people weren't even paying attention.

Now that I've explained the form of a controlled experiment, perhaps you can see how this is not a legitimate objection. What you are saying is that someone, somewhere, once tried to replicate a psi experiment, but they were getting significant deviations from chance during their control run as well as their experimental run. This says that this group which attempted to replicate it did not have a true random number generator. They purchased or constructed a defective piece of hardware which was not random, and thus, they always received deviations from chance. This does not invalidate studies which DID use true random number generators, and DID see deviations from chance in the experimental runs which were significantly different from the deviations during the control runs. Their experimental designs, being "controlled", already explicitly tested for the problem the group you mentioned was having.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 09:30:51 PM by kobok » Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #89 on: July 15, 2006, 04:55:10 AM »

Quote

"I didn't think you would understand. It seems you are incapable of calculating that when something happens 20,000 times the second time and it happened 0 times the first time it is a two million percent increase. Let's break it down for the laymen in this thread (You). If something happens 0 times the first time and 1 time the second time it is a 100% increase. Now multiply that by 20,000. It's very obvious to me now, why you would say that the results are insignificant. All you seem to be able to say is "If it were relevant 'they' wouldn't say it isn't" They being scientists that claim to have looked over the data provided and come to a scientific conclusion.

"Oh no, the scientists of the world say it is flat, you must be an idiot for saying otherwise. Who are you to them anyway? Where are your degree's Christopher

Columbus?! I don't have to check anything because those intelligent scientists told me so!"

That seems to be your argument, like a broken record you keep saying "If it were true the scientists wouldn't say it isn't!". Now that we have established that your math is not only flawed but you are unable to understand and calculate simple mathematical concepts I don't think you get to say what math is or isn't wrong here. You should accept what we say as truth without question. It seems to be what you've done with all of the sceptics, because we all know you're unable to calculate the results yourself."

The -best- part here, is that you don't understand the fundamental tenants of mathematics at work here, and are seeking to assert ignorance on my part of same. Obviously, you don't understand statistics at all, and neither understand how to read significance. An occurrence of 1 deviation outside the expected, statistical zero is not a significant "100%" percent increase, in the scope of the thousands of times 1's and 0's are being generated. There are, in fact, a mathematically/statistically expected number of deviations away from statistical expectation of exactly the same number of 1's and 0's (And in fact, I seriously doubt your claim that the machine ran exactly the same number of 1's and 0's, to come out exactly to 50/50 split, any of the times it ran. That said, -do-link to where you ascertained that to be the case, if you're not just running off at the mouth in an attempt to appear knowledgeable and high-handed.). So, each "1" that occurred out of say, 1,000 runs, above the expected number, was not a large chunk increase in occurrence or deviation. Most of them, and as many mathematicians/statisticians are saying in review of data, ALL of them, ran well within the statistically acceptable realm of what will, by random chance alone, range in the scope of deviations from statistical expected.

And since we seem to be on the topic of comprehension, it's exceedingly evident that you are incapable of gleaning the meaning from large blocks of words put before you. This is the sort've generic, useful literacy skill that woefully, in escaping you, will hinder your ability to appear intelligent when spouting your GGKKKbbq1 kthnx! internet psiclaims. My litany is not that extremely well educated individuals that make a living doing what is claimed in this situation as being evidence of psychic activity, review the data and find no evidence at all of same. The issue is not "OMG they said it is teh not tru3, so it's not!", it is that there is nothing 'true' here to be disputed, because there is STILL no proof, or even reliable evidence. You're essentially trying to back one horse, and ignore the 80 other horses running past it. Convenient. You'll take the word of one statistician as to the validity of the work, but her partner on the same project who is equally as qualified, sees nothing valid in it, and you ignore it. Other scientists step forward and similarly see no validity, or point out numerous faults in her conclusions and data assembly, and you ignore them too. Unfortunately for you, you don't get to cite evidence that supports, and ignore evidence to the contrary.

Lol. "2 million percent" deviation, indeed.

« Last Edit: July 15, 2006, 05:15:29 AM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7 8 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.105.html>

1 capture

30 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

30

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 11:35:27 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207355 Posts in 14734 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 98 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ New level of skepticm 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «

previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 6 7 [8] 9Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticm (Read 15098 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4743
Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #105 on: July 18, 2006, 02:57:28 AM »

MachineChimera, the volume of your text is somewhat redundant in its content. I will attempt to reply only to each point once. Please try to constrain your comments to the points you believe are most relevant so that the length of these posts does not balloon out of reasonable manageability.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Again, we do not need to turn to silly arguments from authority for this. We can, in fact, calculate the deviation from chance exactly using trivial formulas. Square root the integral for the second moment over the interval in question, and you obtain the standard deviation. Fortunately, in this case, it reduces to the very trivial formula"

We could in fact, if you could get the two sides to agree on what exactly constitutes the data to feed into the calculations, which, as is evident to anyone reading the thread thusfar, is the source of contention, not the tried and tested formulas involved. An excellent attempt on your part however to drag the attention to a solid formula, and away from the actual issue of invalid data being ran through it to yield results.

I focused carefully on explaining the formulas to you because you demonstrated in your earlier posts that you misunderstood the key concepts demonstrated by these formulas. You argued several times that the magnitude of an effect determined its likelihood to occur by chance, when this is not the case. I hope we are clear on this point now, as that was my intention for explaining the statistics carefully.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"So yes, your dismissal of results of this magnitude as insignificant is a statistical error on your part. In fact, it is a statistical error on the part of anyone, no matter what their education, who claims the results are statistically insignificant."

Again, I'll sit in humor while you attempt to assert that anyone, no matter how much more education and knowledge they have with any of the subjects you've used to arrive at your distorted perception of psi's validity, is wrong, if they disagree with you, while

those educated figures you've dropped (in tandem to their credentials it might be noted, while in the same moments feeling free to turn about and attempt arguing that someone's education or qualifications isn't important. Hm.) that do agree with your take on the issue, are all qualified and relevant experts to submit.

If they disagree with the basic statistical concept that I showed above, then yes, they are wrong, regardless of their qualifications. This does not require rhetorical rewording.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Since you're talking about putting the cart before the horse, let's put your own cart behind it's conveyance, and address that the results of such testing would be proof, if any of them actually did turn out conclusively and inarguably to be supportive of actual deviations from chance, would be evidence that something is occurring between the person and the machine, and not evidence of anything in specific being that cause, until you can determine how the results are coming about.

If we modulate only one variable, the focused intention of the participant, with nothing else changing, and the results fluctuate accordingly, then by the principles of controlled experimentation this is the cause. Understanding the mechanism is not required to draw this conclusion.

Similarly, if in a controlled experiment I leave one piece of cheese on the kitchen counter, and another piece of cheese in the fridge, and the one on the kitchen counter becomes fuzzy faster with repeatability, then I know that cheese becomes fuzzy faster outside of the fridge than inside of it. I do not need to know anything about the enzymes and mechanisms within mold to deduce that this effect is true given the observations of a controlled experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

I.e., what's causing them. Do tell me, what is the parapsychological assertion at present as to how psi works? Is it a wave function coming from the brain? How does it affect the generation of 1's and 0's? Tell us what exactly we should be looking for, to say conclusively that yes, this is in fact Psi, causing this deviation.

The only available conclusion within parapsychology is that at this time there is no physical mechanism to look for. There is no electromagnetic mediation, no known particle mediation, and no known quantum mechanical method for classical information transfer at a distance. In fact, it can be concluded that all known mechanisms within known physics cannot explain the results of psi experiments. If this is philosophically discomforting for you to not know how something works, then I apologize. But that is the result.

If you are genuinely interested in discussing my personal theories for the mechanism of operation, then we can do this. But this is not a parapsychological observation. It is key that we keep clear that these are different categories of things. So if you want to discuss them, it should be for the sole purpose of your own curiosity about my theories

for the mechanism of operation. If not, we shall simply move on to another topic.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

If I have the winning lotto ticket in a billion to one drawing, and I win, I cannot freely make up what exactly caused me to win, and say that my winning is evidence of that cause's veracity.

You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely differently.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

And yes, you can change SOME tester's IQ scoring. You cannot change many of the testers by such estimations.

It is incorrect to categorize this as an isolated effect. However, my psychology textbook on motivation is at the office, so I do not have the reference on hand for the studies which demonstrate this.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Where is the critical thinking and research on your Constructs, I wonder?

They are a technique which yields results. For your purposes, you can think of this like you would think of a basketball player who visualizes his shots before attempting a basket. You cannot directly observe him doing the visualization, but you can observe the effects. If the effect is that when he visualizes he succeeds better, then this is a good technique for him to use. To my knowledge, there are no controlled double-blind studies on constructs or on basketball players visualizing baskets. However, both are still used as techniques simply because they are found to be effective by the ones who take part in these respective activities.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Uhhh... What do you not understand about what I just said? Is it that you don't believe me that this is how controlled experiments are done?"

Again, an excellent attempt to divert attention from what's being contested, to something that is already accepted fact, and not at issue at all. I'll reiterate for your benefit, since you didn't seem to understand my response the first time around. Your controls led to what you interpret as successes, and the same successess were achieved without the control that was necessary in the "successssful" tests. If you assert that psi phenomena can happen, and happens by concentrating on the outcome for a desired effect.. and someone else replicates statistical deviation from chance, without concentration, then obviously concentration isn't needed. This means A) you think Psi happens regardless of your attempt to employ it or not/sans conscious intent, or B) psi wasn't responsible for the successes. This is, again, where asserting some theory as to how psi behaves and

is expressed/works, would actually let you link a result to psi as it's origin.

Your conclusion does not logically follow from your premise. Allow me to write it out explicitly:

Experimental Setup #1:

Control run with large N: Within expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental Setup #2:

Control run with large N: Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Now, you are trying to tell us to deduce from this that Experiment #1's results are invalid. This conclusion does not logically follow from the information given. Experiment #1 has only one variable changed from the Control run and the Experimental run, and by changing only this one variable, the participant intent, a largely significant deviation results in the measurement. The setup in experiment #2 is faulty from the beginning, because the control run is invalid. This indicates a strong probability that experiment #2 is utilizing faulty hardware if its RNG is ALWAYS yielding non-chance results.

As I explained, for RNG experiments, a preliminary control run is usually done when a setup is first created to ensure that the RNG is actually random. This is a standard sanity check to make sure your equipment is working before you even think about conducting an experiment. If someone's setup fails the equipment check, then they are not ready to do an experiment.

And once this is done, "results" in a controlled experiment are entirely based on the differences between the experimental run and the control run. Because of this, the evaluation of each experiment can in principle be done completely independently of other experiments and setups. The presence of a control run of significant length, and the protocol of results being a comparison between the experimental and the control run, mean that when only one variable is altered between the two conditions, and a significant result is obtained, then a causal relationship has been demonstrated.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

More one-sided, in that you, and Radin, rather comically attempt to claim the evidence is overwhelming and conclusive, and I have already provided link after link and quote after quote, and will provide further, as to that it is anything BUT conclusive, or overwhelming, but is rather still being hotly contested. Maybe you're not sure what those words actually mean?

I've never once claimed that the evidence is uncontested. In fact, I've said it IS

contested. But it is also overwhelming and conclusive. The overwhelmingness and conclusivity of evidence are purely a measure of its intrinsic scientific strength. For evidence to be uncontested, it must be unquestioned. Sadly, the latter does not follow from the former when cherished philosophies are involved.

You have demonstrated for us a propensity for arguing against a point, even when faced with a blatantly obvious scan of a page which shows one thing when you are saying it shows another. How can we expect that scientific evidence will be given a fairer shake than an image right before your eyes? Clearly contention has nothing to do with truth for many.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM
Quote

"When skeptical researchers and researchers who believe give their participants different instructions in different tones, then yes, results differ. But that is not repetition, that is changing a key aspect of the experiment. Skeptics who participate in studies while a researcher who believes instructs the participants have found positive results. In addition, studies in which a computer instructs and interacts with the participant have also found positive results."

Quite so: tone and interaction does have a rather large impact on the outcome of results, and you're quite right, that is changing a key aspect of the experiment: For successes to occur, the researcher is generally someone that believes in the existence of psi! Miraculously, when the researcher Doesn't, evidence fails to come up.

This seems to have much less to do with the researcher's beliefs than with the researcher's handling of participants. What is quite well documented is that the expectations of participants enormously change their ability to do psi. If participants believe they will fail, the results are very weak or negative. If participants believe they will succeed, the results are generally strong or positive. This can and has been well-established using two-tailed test. (The two-tailed test raises the required threshold for statistical significance to allow analysis of variables that can go in two directions.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

As to the computer studies, please provide link or book source to the studies in question? I actually would pull that book from the library, if it's out there, showing repeated successes in a controlled environment that didn't involve a human researcher predisposed to belief, or to desire successful results.

I look forward to hearing your conclusions after reading the following information. I will attempt to place the auto-ganzfeld references I have available in chronological order:

Honorton, C., and E. I. Schechter. 1987. Ganzfeld target retrieval with an automated testing system: A model for initial ganzfeld success. In *Research in Parapsychology 1986*, edited by D. B. Weiner and R. D. Nelson, 36-39

Broughton, R. S., H. Kanthamani, and A. Khilji. 1990. Assessing the PRL success model on an independent ganzfeld data base. In *Research in Parapsychology 1989*, edited by L. Henkel and J. Palmer, 32-35.

Honorton, C., R. E. Berger, M. P. Varvoglis, M. Quant, P. Derr, E. I. Schechter, and D. C. Ferrari. 1990. Psi communication in the ganzfeld: Experiments with an automated testing system and a comparison with a meta-analysis of earlier studies. *Journal of Parapsychology* 54:99-139.

Schlitz, M. J., and C. Honorton. 1992. Ganzfeld psi performance within an artistically gifted population. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research* 86:83-98

Radin, D. I. 1993. The Video Ganzfeld System. Technical Report, Koestler Chair of Parapsychology, Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of Edinburgh.

Bem, D. J., and C. Honorton. 1994. Does psi exist? Replicable evidence for an anomalous process of information transfer. *Psychological Bulletin* 115:4-18

Wezelman, R., and J. L. F. Gerding. 1994. The set-effect analysis: A post hoc analysis of displacement in Utrecht ganzfeld-data. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 37th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Bierman, D. J. 1995. The Amsterdam Ganzfeld Series III and IV: Target clip emotionality, effect sizes and openness. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Broughton, R. S., and C. Alexander. 1995. Autoganzfeld II: The first 100 sessions. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Dalton, K. S., R. L. Morris, D. Delanoy, D. I. Radin, and R. Wiseman. 1996. Security measures in an automated ganzfeld system. *Journal of Parapsychology* 60 (2): 120-148

Morris, R. L., K. Dalton, D. Delanoy, and C. Watt. 1995. Comparison of the sender/no sender condition in the ganzfeld. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychology Association Convention*.

Parker, A., A. Frederiksen, and H. Johansson. 1997. Towards specifying the recipe for success with the ganzfeld: Replication of the ganzfeld findings using a manual ganzfeld with subjects reporting subjective paranormal experiences. *European Journal of Parapsychology* 16

Wezelman, R., J. L. F. Gerding, and I. Verhoeven. 1997. Eigensender ganzfeld psi: An experiment in practical philosophy. *European Journal of Parapsychology*, 13, 28-39.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

2)The experimenter working with the receiver or the receiver herself "may detect creases, marks, smudges, temperature differences or other artifacts that result if actual targets have been handled and then mixed in with targets from a pool for judging. Handling cues may also result when targets placed in envelopes are opened and then resealed or placed in new envelopes, as has sometimes been done. Ideally, two sets of targets should be used, one handled by the sender and the other given to the receiver for review. 64% of the studies did not use duplicate target sets of pictures for the "Sending the Target" phase of the testing.

This criticism was made obsolete by the separate sets of videos being computer controlled in the autoganzfeld studies, and the observed effect remained consistent.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

...In 1981 or 1982, Honorton sent all the reported studies to Hyman who proceeded to do a meta-analysis of them. Hyman concluded that the data did not warrant belief in psi, primarily because of many flaws he found in the experiments themselves. He found three types of flaws: 1- security flaws (sensory leakage; information could have been transferred by experimenters to receivers by talking in the hallway or inadvertently communicating information during the judging phase); 2- statistical flaws; and 3- procedural flaws (randomization problems; documentation problems). He rejected twenty studies as being fatally flawed. That amounted to about half the database. He stripped the data down to twenty-two studies by eight investigators and 746 trials, which accounted for 48% of the data base.

You neglected the most important part of this... Even after Hyman removed the 20 studies he was skeptical of, and kept only the 28 he did like, the odds against chance using only those 28 studies were THEN ten billion to one.

So even when Hyman removed everything he could find to be critical of, the results were still overwhelming. (The autoganzfeld was then formulated to remove the criticisms that came up during this analysis.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

5)"analyses of what I did get uncovered some peculiar and strong patterns in the data. All of the significant hitting was done on the second or later appearance of a target. If we examined the guesses against just the first occurrences of targets, the result is consistent with chance. Moreover, the hit rate rose systematically with each additional

occurrence of a target.

What you should expect is that participants get better at the task as they receive practice. This is sensible, and it has been observed in ganzfeld experiments and elsewhere that when participants receive feedback telling them whether or not they were right (as occurs in ganzfeld experiments), their subsequent scores improve. This effect can easily result in the correlation described.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

6)Despite Radin's claim of successss against the odds in excess of a trillion to one, Andrew Endersby writes "At the end of my research I find a hit rate of between 28.6% and 28.9% depending on certain choices concerning which scoring methods to use on particular experiments. This doesn't have quite the headline grabbing appeal of 1 in 3 instead of 1 in 4 but the hit rate is still highly significant for 6,700 sessions. However, this contains all experiments. Flawed or not, standard or not. ... (Once more, we have at issue the data being fed into the formula in order to create the illusion of 'success' or statistical, whopping deviation, when none is actually present. I suppose it's easy to create a success when you get to pick which experiment results go into the meta-analysis, huh?)

His results were ALSO "highly significant", by his own words, entirely of their own accord.

Regarding which data is included in meta-analyses, that depends on the format of the experiment. When examining strict replication of the autoganzfeld, those doing a meta-analysis only accept experiments which follow the format strictly, and exclude those who attempt new deviations. The deviations from the original format have value in that they are trying something new, but they are not precise replications.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

10)"In 1987, Dean Radin and Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says "in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chancee" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143).

Your point? When you include "all" the data for a real effect, it is quite sensible that the odds are much higher than simply including a subset of the data (the PEAR data). The results are similar, meaning the effect sizes were consistent, but with more runs, the

odds that it is measuring a non-chance effect improve, just like in the statistical formula I provided at the top of my previous post.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? The part that doesn't say which way is YOUR text. The part I stated DOES specific which way."

Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? Or do you not understand the meaning in text? I'll simplify for you. Stating what will happen, is not stating which way/how it will happen. Saying "I will make more 1's than is usual by natural occurrence" is stating what you claim will happen. It does not state how, in which way, or to what degree. It is as vague as saying "I will get food from the store." It says nothing about what food, how much, or how you will arrive there to get it.

By that logic, saying that you will try to make as many baskets as you can in a game of basketball has no meaning.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

if I get an insignificant number of 6's in a roll, but I get such insignificant numbers over the course of a long enough duration as to indicate some statistical significance above chance, as would be the case if I got just 1 six above normal in enough rolls, it would not be significant statistically. When the same thing happens with the number of 1's in an RNG, it's different. When critics point out the number of 1's generated was not much above the normal, Utts, Radin, and people like you claim it is, because of the number of such insignificant successes above chance over the course of the tests.

I have no idea what you are trying to say here.

But if you really want to understand, roll that six-sided dice of yours 10,000 times, really high, and make sure it loops at least 6 or 7 times each throw. If you get more than 1720 or so fours, then you should be outrageously surprised. Feel free to try this several times.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Quoting Einstein about quantum mechanics won't be very successful, because he is widely regarded to have been quite wrong about it. His contribution to pointing out that the EPR test was there to be made was a stroke of genius, but his assumptions about the result which would be obtained were quite wrong."

His assumption that something IS wrong however is not quite wrong, and is still being sought after by some of the best minds in the fields today. Hawkings, the predominant theoretical physicist of our times, and one of the most well known/famous, agreed with him on many things, including his "assumptions" about gravity in several aspects. Not

that it's relevant: EPR is not at all meaningful in the context of Determinism's truth, any more than you'd site the numerous, overwhelming, conclusive (all actually appropriately used, in this case, it might be noted) frauds and failures in psychic tests thusfar as evidence that Psi does not exist.

Uh... Einstein's famous quote about quantum mechanics and determinism is "God does not play dice with the universe". Hawking's famous quote in response to this is "Not only does God play dice, but... he sometimes throws them where they cannot be seen." So even Hawking is convinced, as are most modern physicists, that the world is non-deterministic based on the weight of evidence. If Einstein had lived long enough to see the current state of evidence, he would probably concur as well.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Not really. If I instruct my computer to use /dev/random as an input, and if we consider that /dev/random utilizes such microthermal fluctuations inside the computer that these are occasionally influenced by quantum processes, and I instruct my computer to fire a bullet based on the result of /dev/random, then whether or not that bullet will fire is non-deterministic. There is no amount of knowledge, practically or theoretically, that you can obtain about the state of the computer which will allow you to deduce whether or not that bullet will fire."

A lack of present knowledge does not constitute absolute veracity of present knowledge. History is exemplary in demonstration of this actuality. Not understanding however, is not grounds for creating an explanation to suit you, such as that no amount of knowledge could be obtained to deduce the outcome of a seemingly probabalistic event.

In quantum mechanics, this rule no longer applies. By the rules of quantum mechanics, the presence of knowledge itself about a system causes its state to change, so this results in a fundamental inability to determine the state of a system. It is not simply an ignorance of how to determine the state, but a consequence of the effect of having that knowledge. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and violates the reasoning we use in the classical world, but hey, that's what quantum mechanics is like.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

Quote from: The Conscious Universe

The graph indicates that around the time that the TV preshow began, at 9:00 A.M. Pacific Time, an unexpected degree of order appeared in all of the RNGs. This soon declined back to random behavior until about 10:00 A.M., which is when the verdict was supposed to be announced. A few minutes later, the order in all five RNGs suddenly peaked to its highest point in the two hours of recorded data precisely when the court clerk read the verdict.

(emphasis mine)

Now, the critic here is calling Radin a liar and claiming that he altered his data, because the critic has taken "about 10:00 A.M." and turned it into "at 10:00 A.M.", and is then complaining that the first peak is not at exactly 10:00 A.M. How ridiculous is that? You are hinging your objection to Radin on the basis of someone who failed to accurately read the text regarding the critical point of his complaint."

After my mirth subsided, I tried to look seriously at that last of yours, but I can't seem to imagine how you'd type it with a straight face. First off, how scientific and rigorous an analysis did Radin do, if he put specific times on his graph, but goes with "About 10:00"am. Secondly, he specifically states A few minutes later, the order in all five RNGs suddenly peaked to its highest point in the two hours of recorded data. What's a few minutes later than 10:00 am? Because the graph shows at that by 10:02 the graph of activity in the RNG spikes had already begun their rapid drop-off. Obviously it was not "a few minutes later" than 10am, as he'd attempt to mislead the readers. It was either 10:01, or the spikes happened before the verdict was read.

You really want to defend that point?

I will simply post the image of the page for anyone reading along to judge for themselves.

(Anyone wishing to read the entire chapter should consider buying it. It is worth the price for anyone interested enough to read through the oversized volume which has become this thread.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"I think you're mistaken. The autoganzfeld experiments, by definition of being "auto", were controlled entirely by computer. The experimenter was not even in the soundproof room with the subject, and the subject was being prompted by an automated computer. Over 354 sessions in this form, the hit rate was 34% (with chance of 25%), yielding odds against chance of 45000 to 1."

Another excellent attempt at misleading: the displaying of images, the orders of test material presentation, etc, were entirely automated by computer. The judging of results after the subjects did their guesswork with the judges themselves, was entirely not automated.

You are obviously mistaken, because there are not even any "judges" for the participants to work with in the standard ganzfeld or autoganzfeld experiments. I suggest you check your source of information more carefully, or, consult the journal articles given above and get the information from the horse's mouth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Again, this is not only a stupid comment, but a blind one. The graph on page 181 has

a point directly on the day of the full moon, and in fact, has the same density of data points around the full moon as elsewhere. You'd have to be completely blind to miss this. The line between data points is not connected between the full moon point and the following data point, but this is because the data collection began and stopped around the full moon (remember of course, the lunar cycle is cyclic)."

That's one way of looking at it. Another way is that, had he included a line between the data points, connected between the full moon point and the following data point, it might demonstrate a pattern of activity not consistent with his attempt to show the influence of the moon and the activity spikes in question.

Your comment is nonsensical. Look at the image I scanned and provided in my previous post, and try to figure out what pattern would be destroyed by connecting the two unconnected points with a straight line...

« Last Edit: July 18, 2006, 03:09:42 AM by kobok » Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #106 on: July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM »

Quote

"I focused carefully on explaining the formulas to you because you demonstrated in your earlier posts that you misunderstood the key concepts demonstrated by these formulas. You argued several times that the magnitude of an effect determined its likelihood to occur by chance, when this is not the case. I hope we are clear on this point now, as that was my intention for explaining the statistics carefully."

I argued no such thing. Further, there has been no point during this discussion at which I've brought to challenge the veracity of any of the formulas mentioned thusfar.

Quote

"If they disagree with the basic statistical concept that I showed above, then yes, they are wrong, regardless of their qualifications. This does not require rhetorical rewording."

No, it does not. What it does require is a dash of critical thinking: you deciding that those who do not agree with your opinion are wrong, is fallacious in the extreme. None of the skeptics quoted or referenced thusfar have questioned the formulas used to derive the claimed success rates, only (as I've repeated over, and over, and over again)

the methods and selectivity involved in the data being considered, or omitted, respectively.

Quote

"If we modulate only one variable, the focused intention of the participant, with nothing else changing, and the results fluctuate accordingly, then by the principles of controlled experimentation this is the cause. Understanding the mechanism is not required to draw this conclusion.

Similarly, if in a controlled experiment I leave one piece of cheese on the kitchen counter, and another piece of cheese in the fridge, and the one on the kitchen counter becomes fuzzy faster with repeatability, then I know that cheese becomes fuzzy faster outside of the fridge than inside of it. I do not need to know anything about the enzymes and mechanisms within mold to deduce that this effect is true given the observations of a controlled experiment."

An apt analogy for the issue, and especially helpful for my case. If the modulate the variable of the cheese being outside of the fridge by leaving it in, and it aged as quickly as the cheese left outside, the hypothesis that the cheese molds/ages faster depending upon the temperature of its surroundings would be unverified. You get the same results in the warm surroundings, as in the chilled/fridge. Just so; when you arrive at the same deviation from chance expectation without concentration, as you did with, it's indicative that concentration is not required for the phenomena that's causing the deviation of chance to occur. If one is asserting that psychic abilities, which require intent/concentration/focus, are behind the results, and the same results are achieved without said intent/concentration/focus, it rather indicates that psychic powers are not responsible.

Quote

"The only available conclusion within parapsychology is that at this time there is no physical mechanism to look for. There is no electromagnetic mediation, no known particle mediation, and no known quantum mechanical method for classical information transfer at a distance. In fact, it can be concluded that all known mechanisms within known physics cannot explain the results of psi experiments. If this is philosophically discomforting for you to not know how something works, then I apologize. But that is the result.

If you are genuinely interested in discussing my personal theories for the mechanism of operation, then we can do this. But this is not a parapsychological observation. It is key that we keep clear that these are different categories of things. So if you want to discuss them, it should be for the sole purpose of your own curiosity about my theories for the mechanism of operation. If not, we shall simply move on to another topic."

Yet again we see the pattern you and those like you employ; attempting to pass off as facts or certainties, your own conclusions. That is not "the result." The result is a lack of explanation for the results at present, not that they are psychic in nature. Indeed,

without providing any basis for how psi behaves, or how psi should be evident, you can no more conclude that your make-believe 'psi' powers are the cause, as any other unknown interaction. Your argument that psi is responsible is as valid and evident as that magical entities that exist between time and space are interacting with the RNGs, or that the weather conditions outside are somehow related to the outcomes: have weather phenomena been studied and contrasted to the data testing patterns? Sounds ridiculous, huh? Yeah. It does to me too.

Quote

"You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely differently."

Oh? So then let's expand it beyond self-selected sample. Let's consider every single person that's ever won the lottery, and the astronomical odds against them. Let's calculate their combined success rate of 'beating chance' by winning the lottery from the time lottery tickets began sales, to present. Now, let's point to the deviation, and then freely create a fantastical explanation for the apparent, unexplainable deviation from expected chance that's occurred. Those damn magical entities between space and time, up to their old tricks again.

Quote

"They are a technique which yields results. For your purposes, you can think of this like you would think of a basketball player who visualizes his shots before attempting a basket. You cannot directly observe him doing the visualization, but you can observe the effects. If the effect is that when he visualizes he succeeds better, then this is a good technique for him to use. To my knowledge, there are no controlled double-blind studies on constructs or on basketball players visualizing baskets. However, both are still used as techniques simply because they are found to be effective by the ones who take part in these respective activities."

Indeed, purely conceptual, and not reflective of actual reality: there are no real constructs running around imbued with spiritual energy, doing tasks or assisting you, outside of your own mind. The difference is that the basketball player doesn't actually believe the technique in question is real, as he imagines it; if he imagines a bullseye over the hoop, he doesn't actually fool himself or others into thinking his imagination is a reflection of that reality.

Quote

"Your conclusion does not logically follow from your premise. Allow me to write it out explicitly:

Experimental Setup #1:

Control run with large N: Within expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental Setup #2:

Control run with large N: Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Now, you are trying to tell us to deduce from this that Experiment #1's results are invalid. This conclusion does not logically follow from the information given.

Experiment #1 has only one variable changed from the Control run and the Experimental run, and by changing only this one variable, the participant intent, a largely significant deviation results in the measurement. The setup in experiment #2 is faulty from the beginning, because the control run is invalid. This indicates a strong probability that experiment #2 is utilizing faulty hardware if its RNG is ALWAYS yielding non-chance results.

As I explained, for RNG experiments, a preliminary control run is usually done when a setup is first created to ensure that the RNG is actually random. This is a standard sanity check to make sure your equipment is working before you even think about conducting an experiment. If someone's setup fails the equipment check, then they are not ready to do an experiment.

And once this is done, "results" in a controlled experiment are entirely based on the differences between the experimental run and the control run. Because of this, the evaluation of each experiment can in principle be done completely independently of other experiments and setups. The presence of a control run of significant length, and the protocol of results being a comparison between the experimental and the control run, mean that when only one variable is altered between the two conditions, and a significant result is obtained, then a causal relationship has been demonstrated."

You don't seem to be getting it: The machine didn't run the deviations from chance without people being involved, in a control run. The RNG produced the deviation from chance far outside the expected, just by having people be involved in the test, without concentrating. Not intent, not focused on changing it's results. Just sitting in front of it, reading a magazine, daydreaming, etc. The same manner of 'success' that is being cited as psychic proof, achieved with the same manner of control run within chance boundaries, and experimental run with test subject in room, just not trying to achieve a difference in it's output. Wee.

Quote

"I've never once claimed that the evidence is uncontested. In fact, I've said it IS contested. But it is also overwhelming and conclusive. The overwhelmingness and conclusivity of evidence are purely a measure of its intrinsic scientific strength. For evidence to be uncontested, it must be unquestioned. Sadly, the latter does not follow from the former when cherished philosophies are involved.

You have demonstrated for us a propensity for arguing against a point, even when

faced with a blatantly obvious scan of a page which shows one thing when you are saying it shows another. How can we expect that scientific evidence will be given a fairer shake than an image right before your eyes? Clearly contention has nothing to do with truth for many."

Another attempt at deception, in the vein of Radin: I have most certainly not been shown a page and argued against a point/it's contents. In my last response, in fact, I specifically noted what the author was saying, in relation to the pages. I even sourced the origin of the information being graphed, which, laughably, was from a quack with a history of being duped and marking down false results as 'scientific evidence.' Further, you either are lying, or simply don't understand what the word "conclusive" means, as you fairly opened up the debate with the statement that the evidence was such, and yet now state you've never claimed the evidence is uncontested. **con·clu·sive** (P) Pronunciation Key (kn-klsv) adj. Serving to put an end to doubt, question, or uncertainty; decisive. See Synonyms at decisive.

Quote

"This seems to have much less to do with the researcher's beliefs than with the researcher's handling of participants. What is quite well documented is that the expectations of participants enormously change their ability to do psi. If participants believe they will fail, the results are very weak or negative. If participants believe they will succeed, the results are generally strong or positive. This can and has been well-established using two-tailed test. (The two-tailed test raises the required threshold for statistical significance to allow analysis of variables that can go in two directions.)"

Another intentional deception; speaking factually about something that has, to date, not been proven as factual. Your assumptive confusions about what you think is happening, and what is actually happening without proper explanation, seem to be an ongoing problem. What is well documented, is that the expectations of a participant in a test can enormously change their ability in a test. There is no correlation between this, and the outcome of a deviation from chance, unless you can demonstrate that the person involved is having some active effect. If a person can sit in front of a machine and read a book, and the machine deviates (as has been repeatedly mentioned, and repeatedly attempted to be glossed over by you and those in your camp) from chance expectation, then obviously the person's confidence level in performance is irrelevant, because they aren't performing anything. They just happen to be in the area of effect. Your claim is much akin to an idiot claiming that a person's confidence level will affect how much they show up on a thermal imaging system: they have no active participation in being seen in a thermal imaging test, and whether they believe they will show up more or less warm for instance, has no actual bearing on how they show up. They are necessary components in the thermal imaging test, but the results of the test, like with the RNGs, are not dependant at all upon their personal abilities or mindset.

Quote

"1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem."

Gladly. "In 1994 Bem and Honorton published a report in the prestigious journal Psychological Bulletin, bringing the research to the notice of a far wider audience. They republished Honorton's earlier meta-analysis and reported impressive new results with a fully automated ganzfeld procedure -- the Princeton autoganzfeld -- claiming finally to have demonstrated a repeatable experiment. Not long afterwards Wiseman, Smith, and Kornbrot (1996) suggested that acoustic leakage might have been possible in the original autoganzfeld. This hypothesis was difficult to assess after the fact because by then the laboratory at Princeton had been dismantled.

As far as I know, no appropriate tests have been made to find out. For example, does the subject need to be conscious of the direction of aim at the time? Comments in the published papers suggest that some subjects actually do better when not thinking about the task, or when reading a magazine or being distracted in some other way, suggesting that conscious intent might even be counterproductive."

Quote

"You neglected the most important part of this... Even after Hyman removed the 20 studies he was skeptical of, and kept only the 28 he did like, the odds against chance using only those 28 studies were THEN ten billion to one.

So even when Hyman removed everything he could find to be critical of, the results were still overwhelming. (The autoganzfeld was then formulated to remove the criticisms that came up during this analysis.)"

To the contrary: the most important part of the quote you're responding to was not the success rate Hyman came to, after editing out a huge 48% of the database. The most important part was that about half of the entire data being used to calculate the successes in such trials, were extremely flawed, and -still- used and considered "objective" by the people making the meta-analysis. People like Utts, Radin, Targ and Puthoff. Further, such flawed materials, even after such criticisms have been pointed out, and the tests yet further refined, are still being mentioned in compilations of 'evidence' by such as Radin, in his issue-riddled Conscious Universe. If successes are to be tallied, they should be tallied only of rates of success counting data that has been deemed unfaulted and not subject to the criticisms thusfar, such as the reformulated autoganzfeld you mentioned. Yet he's still using outdated, flawed materials in his book, and such are still being pointed to today by Parapsychologists in support of psi.

Quote

"What you should expect is that participants get better at the task as they receive practice. This is sensible, and it has been observed in ganzfeld experiments and elsewhere that when participants receive feedback telling them whether or not they were right (as occurs in ganzfeld experiments), their subsequent scores improve. This

effect can easily result in the correlation described."

What I should reasonably expect is that people get better at something with practice. Practice and improvement should not happen and be evident across the board between the first and second try, in the matter of a minute or less, especially without feedback on success or failure of the first attempt before the second is attempted. Practice generally provides improvement based upon noticing a previous failure, or technique that can be corrected, and then applying that correction of technique gained from the previous attempt's failure. The subjects in question had no means of knowing whether their previous guess had been success or failure when the image reappeared, which is not indicative of improvement through 'practice' as you would have us believe, but an improvement based upon observation of the testing methods or materials.

Quote

"His results were ALSO "highly significant", by his own words, entirely of their own accord.

Regarding which data is included in meta-analyses, that depends on the format of the experiment. When examining strict replication of the autoganzfeld, those doing a meta-analysis only accept experiments which follow the format strictly, and exclude those who attempt new deviations. The deviations from the original format have value in that they are trying something new, but they are not precise replications."

His results were also including "all experiments. Flawed or not, standard or not." His apparent rate of success by his own admission then, is taking into consideration that he cannot be sure the data used to come to such a conclusion was even valid or accurate in either controls or gathering. This is the specific brand of deceptive quotation or misquotation that Radin employs in his book, which has yet, I've noticed, to be addressed by you.

Also, we'll note the criticism earlier mentioned that in his book, Radin does not employ the same method of strict format used in his own analysis and presentation of his 'evidences', applying the effects of the lunar phases or various other energy sources in some, as he does to others. If his opinion is correct, what has he to lose by including in every graph that supposedly supports his claims, all the measuring aspects and associations he notes throughout his book, so that we can see the overall relations, or not, that are actually present? Hm.

Quote

MachineChimera

Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? Or do you not understand the meaning in text? I'll simplify for you. Stating what will happen, is not stating which way/how it will happen. Saying "I will make more 1's than is usual by natural occurrence" is stating what you claim will happen. It does not state how, in which way, or to what degree. It is as vague as saying "I will get food from the store." It says nothing about what food, how much, or how you will arrive there to get it.

Kobok

"By that logic, saying that you will try to make as many baskets as you can in a game of basketball has no meaning."

Negative. Saying you will make "as many baskets as you can" in a game is not a claim of an ability. It's a claim of intent. A test does not verify the absence or presence of intent. Stating "I will shoot 4 more baskets than I normally do" is a claim of ability. It can be tested.

Quote

"I have no idea what you are trying to say here.

But if you really want to understand, roll that six-sided dice of yours 10,000 times, really high, and make sure it loops at least 6 or 7 times each throw. If you get more than 1720 or so fours, then you should be outrageously surprised. Feel free to try this several times."

According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994).

Really? ONE lonely 1 more than chance in every thousand RNG outputs? That's hardly the attention-grabbing "1720 or so" out of a cycle of 6 or 7 throws, thrown 10,000 times. But then you, like Radin, seem to have a growing history of sensationalistic claims. See below for more on this.

Quote

"Uh... Einstein's famous quote about quantum mechanics and determinism is "God does not play dice with the universe". Hawking's famous quote in response to this is "Not only does God play dice, but... he sometimes throws them where they cannot be seen." So even Hawking is convinced, as are most modern physicists, that the world is non-deterministic based on the weight of evidence. If Einstein had lived long enough to see the current state of evidence, he would probably concur as well."

You're responding by not responding to what I typed. What a novel idea! Hawkings agrees with Einstein in regard to much of his gravitational theorem, and further the issue was that Determinism has not been proven anything, either wrong or right. It's still being pursued by many minds in the community, and is still a the rule for pretty much everything that's NOT quantum in science, primarily the natural sciences. And How did you come to conclude what Einstein's thoughts would probably be, were he alive today, on the subject? Another assumption stated in a factual fashion... or did you channel him with your psychic power?

Quote

"In quantum mechanics, this rule no longer applies. By the rules of quantum

mechanics, the presence of knowledge itself about a system causes its state to change, so this results in a fundamental inability to determine the state of a system. It is not simply an ignorance of how to determine the state, but a consequence of the effect of having that knowledge. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and violates the reasoning we use in the classical world, but hey, that's what quantum mechanics is like."

Mm. Well, if the RNG is truly a quantumly generated function, governed by quantum law, then knowledge of how it should behave will alter its behavioral state, by your own admission. So you cannot possibly discern what is actual affect resulting from anyone's interaction with it based upon some ability or power, and what is simply resulting because of the person's knowledge of how the system will behave, alone. Sounds like an awful predicament to be in, frankly.

Quote

"You really want to defend that point?"

I will simply post the image of the page for anyone reading along to judge for themselves.

(Anyone wishing to read the entire chapter should consider buying it. It is worth the price for anyone interested enough to read through the oversized volume which has become this thread.)"

Obviously, I'm asserting it, so yes, do scan the page in question so we can all see the graph, and note when the spike in question begins to drop off, against the time the verdict was actually read.

As to the graph on page 181, I'm not certain if the writer in question was talking about the actual graph, or the information relating to it on the pages preceeding and following it. I am certain however, that it's laughable that Puharich's "telepathy test" is even being included at all as valid evidence by Radin himself. Puharich is, besides gallivanting about the scientific community backing Uri's amazing powers, the same nut that brought over Peter Hurkos, and claimed among other things to have invented a perpetual energy device. The man is by all accounts, a delusional, paranoid crackpot. Radin's building himself quite a case with a book inclusive of data from cases blatantly outdated as far as controls against fraud and objectivity-biased experimented, including the ganzfeld themselves. Stargate was dropped not merely by the government at large, but by the CIA following, as being unsuccessful. Autoganzfeld seems to be just about the only thing left to cling to for you psi-supporters, and even it is not conclusive, as we've demonstrated with the very defining of the word, contrary to your personal word choice.

Going back to the PEAR experiments, I'll repost the following: "In 1987, Dean Radin and Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says "in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall

experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chance" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143). Nelson also claimed that there were no "star" performers."

REALLY? No star performers? They all did equally well across the board, that seems to imply. So then why do we find .. ""the percentage of hits in the intended direction was only 50.02%" in the PEAR studies (Hyman 1989: 152). And one 'operator' (the term used to describe the subjects in these studies) was responsible for 23% of the total data base. His hit rate was 50.05%. Take out this operator and the hit rate becomes 50.01%. According to John McCrone, "Operator 10," believed to be a PEAR staff member, "has been involved in 15% of the 14 million trials, yet contributed to a full half of the total excess hits" (McCrone 1994). According to Dean Radin, the criticism that there "was any one person responsible for the overall results of the experiment...was tested and found to be groundless" (Radin 1997: 221). His source for this claim is a 1991 article by Jahn et al. in the Journal of Scientific Exploration, "Count population profiles in engineering anomalies experiments" (5:205-32). However, Jahn gives the data for his experiments in Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World (Harcourt Brace, 1988, p. 352-353). McCrone has done the calculations and found that 'If [operator 10's] figures are taken out of the data pool, scoring in the "low intention" condition falls to chance while "high intention" scoring drops close to the .05 boundary considered weakly significant in scientific results.' According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994)."

Why do we continue to see a pattern of Radin sensationalizing findings by attributing such words as "conclusive", "proof", or exaggerating the odds or statistical importance of issues, while claiming to be a skeptic, and entirely leaving out such little tidbits of information when pretending to give a balanced argument to his readers? Also, to date.. where's the response to McCrone's insight by Radin?

Further, you've repeatedly ignored various points of interest in this debate, such as Radin's blatant attempts at deception in his book, by misquoting people he claims are in agreement with his own findings. You've ignored that he claims himself as one of the Associates and Advisors, for purposes of 'genuine skepticism', and further includes under that facility Larry Dosey, a man that thinks he has scientific proof that prayer heals... Gary Swartz, who actually thinks John Edwards gets messages from the dead, and Rupert Sheldrake, The group of them also list as one of their advisors a man who's been dead for over 3 years now (Marcello Truzzi). He seems to think that he and these other fellows constitute genuine skeptics, and are unbiased and credible in

providing same against his own claims? Radin claims there are "thousands" of experiments that -prove- psi exists. To date, not one is recorded as proof of psi. Certainly, even if you counted Autoganzfeld as proof, that would leave about 1,999 more examples to list. As to his mathematical arrival at significance, which you seem so fond of bandying about, we have the following: "Potentially the most important evidence in Radin's book is the chapter on meta-analysis, which is also emphasized in the introduction--and it is here that the 'file drawer' effect comes into play.

Meta-analysis is the combination of results from many experiments. A problem in meta-analysis, and in statistics generally, is how to allow for the researches that remain unpublished and unknown because their P values did not reach a conventional significance level such as 0.05. I do not know who coined the name 'file drawer' effect for this problem. This effect drags down the statistical significance of published work. Radin claims that "parapsychologists were among the first to become sensitive to this problem"--although he does not say when--and he mentions that "in 1975 the Parapsychological Association's officers adopted a policy opposing the selective reporting of positive outcomes". The problem was known to statisticians by 1958.

Consider the following typical example. Radin points out that there were 186 publications on ESP card tests worldwide from 1882 to 1939. "The combined results of this four-million trial database [taken at face value]," he says, "translate into tremendous odds against chance--more than a billion trillion to one." (A 'trial' is the guess of one card) He means that the P value is about 10^{-21} --he is not writing only for the scientific establishment. This P value corresponds to a bulge above 'chance' expectation of 9.5 sigma, where sigma is the standard deviation. (I call that a 'sigmage' of 9.5.)

Apart from the possibility of conscious and unconscious fraud and wishful thinking in some fraction of the publications, Radin claims, with no explanation, that, in order to "nullify" the statistical significance, the file drawer would have to contain "more than 3,300 unpublished, unsuccessful reports for each published report". That number 3,300 is a gross overestimate. It should be reduced at least to about 15 (or even to Cool.

The expected sigmage in the file drawer, under the null hypothesis, would be slightly negative but I will call it zero. If these results were combined with the published work, the total sample size would be multiplied by 16, thus becoming 64 million individual guesses. Given the null hypothesis ('chance'), the bulge would be unaffected so the sigmage would be divided by $\sqrt{16} = 4$ and would become $9.5/4 = 2.4$ with a P value of about 1/100.

Because the number of individual guesses is so large, this P value appreciably SUPPORTS the null hypothesis (no ESP). This is because a Bayes factor (the factor by which the odds of a hypothesis are multiplied in light of the observations), corresponding to a fixed P value, is roughly proportional to $1/\sqrt{N}$, where N is the sample size. So Radin's method for evaluating the file-drawer effect, whatever that method may be, must be misguided. This conclusion largely undermines Radin's meta-analysis which is central to his case for ESP."

As noted by I.J. Good, called by many to be, at the very least, a major contributor.. if not the promulgator, of Bayesian Statistics. The man is far, far more experienced with proper statistical calculations than Radin, and I doubt anyone in any community would state that Radin has a better grasp of statistics, or calculating a P value, than Good.

"Radin quotes Hansel as saying that three P values, each of 0.01, amount to one of 10^{-6} , and that he (Radin) would find that convincing. But the product of independent P values is not a P value. The product has to be transformed by a method due to R. A. Fisher. Both Hansel and Radin have overlooked this. In the present example, the composite P value is 1/9000 not 1/1,000,000."

As to J.B. Rhine. "Langmuir visited J.B. Rhine's lab at Duke University where Rhine was claiming results of ESP experiments that could not be predicted by chance and were probably due to some sort of psychic power. Langmuir found that Rhine was not counting all his data, however. He was leaving out the scores of those he believed were guessing their Zener cards wrong on purpose. "Rhine believed that persons who disliked him guessed wrong to spite him. Therefore, he felt it would be misleading to include their scores" (Park 2000, 42). Rhine determined that some of his subjects were deliberately guessing wrong because their scores were too low to have occurred by chance. "Indeed, he was convinced that abnormally low scores were as significant as abnormally high scores in proving the existence of ESP" (ibid.)."

Further, when Rhine's studies were attempted to be reproduced, no success came about. Soal did four years without any results, before eventually being busted under investigation for fraud when he DID start claiming results.

"S. G. Soal (1889-1975) was a British mathematician. By 1939 he had tested over 160 subjects for ESP in more than 128,000 card-guessing trials and had found no evidence of telepathy or clairvoyance. Whately Carrington advised Soal to recheck his data for displacement (Alcock 1981: 154). Someone with psychic powers might be one or two cards ahead or behind in the guessing because of "temporal distraction." The data mining, conducted by Carrington, Robert Thouless, and Mrs. K. M. Goldney, produced two cases that were statistically significant (Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research 46, 1940-1941). The two stars were Mrs. Gloria Stewart, who did significantly better than chance at naming the card ahead and the card behind the target card in the test series, even though that was not her task nor her intention (Hansel 1989: 100). The other star, Shackleton, had also been unimpressive in tests done in 1938. The "high displacement scores that Soal alleges he found three years later were the first indication of any striking effects in Shackleton's score sheets" (Hansel 1989: 101)."

"Today, it is generally recognized that Soal altered and faked the data, probably unbeknownst to Mrs. Goldney (Alcock 1981: 141). His fraud did significant damage to parapsychology (Alcock 1981: 140-141). Yet, there are still those who hail his work as having produced "the most cogent of all the evidence brought forth to demonstrate the theory of psychic abilities in mankind" (an admirer on the Internet). But those familiar

with the history of parapsychology recognize Soal's deception. Dean Radin, for example, in his elaborate and selective defense of the scientific evidence for psi (*The Conscious Universe*) does not even mention Soal."

Hm. Radin uses Rhine's data, or makes mention of it in a possitive light, I bet, in his book.. but doesn't mention the four years of it's exact replication yielding no results? Or the subsequent cheating done by Soal to follow? How strange.

Further, as to Radin's assumption that psi is at work because of a statistical deviation from what is EXPECTED by chance. "The assumption is also questionable on methodological grounds. There is no reason to believe that the laws of probability, which are purely formal and ideal, should apply directly to any finite set of events. It may be true that the odds of a coin coming up heads or tails is 1 in 2, but that gives us no information as to what will happen in the real world for any given number of tosses. Ideally, in a large number of tosses, heads should come up 50% of the time. In the real world, there is no way to know exactly how many times heads will come up in, say, ten million tosses. We can be pretty sure the number will be very close to five million (assuming a fair coin and a fair toss), but we cannot know a priori exactly how many times heads will come up.

Studies comparing random strings with random strings, to simulate guessing numbers or cards, have found significant departures from what would be expected theoretically by chance (Alcock 1981: 159). For example, Harvie "selected 50,000 digits from various sources of random numbers and used them to represent "target cards" in an ESP experiment. Instead of having subjects make guesses, a series of 50,000 random numbers were produced by a computer." He found a hit rate that was significantly less than what would be predicted by chance (Alcock 1981: 158-159).

In the 1930s, Walter Pitkin of Columbia University printed up 200,000 cards, half red and half blue, with 40,000 of each of the five ESP card symbols. The cards were mechanically shuffled and read by a machine. The result was two lists of 100,000 randomly selected symbols. One list would represent chance distribution of the symbols and the other would represent chance guessing of the symbols. However, the actual matches and what would be predicted by accepted odds didn't match up. The total number was 2% under mathematical expectancy. Runs of 5 matching pairs were 25% under and runs of 7 were 59% greater than mathematical expectancy (Christopher 1970: 27-28). The point is not whether these runs are typical in a real world of real randomness or whether they represent some peculiarity of the shuffling machine or some other quirk. The point is that it is not justified to assume that statistical probability based on true randomness and a very large number of instances applies without further consideration to any finite operation in the real world such as guessing symbols in decks of 25 cards shuffled who knows how or how often, or rolling dice, or trying to affect a random number generator with one's mind. As Alcock put it: "If such significant variation can be produced by comparing random strings with random strings, then the assumption that any significant variation from chance is due to psi seems untenable (Alcock 1981: 158-159)."

The logical fallacy here, it should be pointed out, is that of Affirming the Consequent. "If it's psi, then the data deviate from chance. The data deviate from chance. So, it's psi. Or, if a person is psychic, that person will do better than chance in guessing experiments. That person did better than chance in a guessing experiment. Therefore, that person is psychic.)" Something that's been pointed out numerous times. Even IF Radin's work could be shaved down to test results that were all, entirely approved and unable to be found faulted or potentially flawed, and even if under these conditions significant deviations from chance expectation could be earned, and even IF these successes were repeatable in other laboratories by skeptics using the same conditions, it would not be proof of Psi. It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance. Notwithstanding, none of those 'if' conditions have been achieved yet, much less the whole of them, yet we still see the flawed logical fallacy at work. Radin assumes as the basis of the entire test that Psi exists, and that Psi can cause/be responsible for such a deviation, and then attributes such a deviation as proof of psi.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:24:19 PM by MachineChimera » Logged

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1064

Karma: 24

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #107 on: July 19, 2006, 12:08:45 PM »

MachineChimera, I'm going to assume you know how psi is defined in parapsychology, but somehow, seem to be neglecting it.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance.

It has always been my understanding that psi is the variable (or in more traditional usage "factor") assigned to those unknown reasons. You're quite right, just as preliminary experiments regarding subatomic particles did not give us precise information on the structure of the atom, our speculation was not affirmed by them.

The same goes for psi, specific explanations are simply speculation. However, psi is an experimental variable, something which either is present or is not, and represents the ability to the experimental results to deviate from chance. Evidence of the nature of psi requires more detailed experiments, where more information is present.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:15:18 PM by Rafnul » Logged

Prophecy

Theurgist

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1230

Karma: 62

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #108 on: July 19, 2006, 12:16:05 PM »

I think next we should argue the existence of string cheese, followed immediately by discarding any possibility of a human being possessing a gallon of milk.

All the scientific data on earth to the contrary could never convince a person who knows he has seen the things he has, and has in fact shared such experiences with multitudes of people, that the contrary opinion could in any shape or form be remotely correct. As I mentioned before your strange infatuation with scientific evidence and the likes is really quite wasted, and you should look into trying to get some of the time back you threw away while gathering it all. I'm surprised you're still having at it, but I suppose everyone needs something to do. In the end, however, you're really only having a discussion with Kobok, and in so far as everyone else is concerned you can only fail at what you may be trying to do.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

MachineChimera

Settling In

*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #109 on: July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM »

Quote

"MachineChimera, I'm going to assume you know how psi is defined in parapsychology,

but somehow, seem to be neglecting it.

Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 12:00:18 PM

It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance.

It has always been my understanding that psi is the variable (or in more traditional usage "factor") assigned to those unknown reasons. You're quite right, just as preliminary experiments regarding subatomic particles did not give us precise information on the structure of the atom, our speculation was not affirmed by them. The same goes for psi, specific explanations are simply speculation. However, psi is an experimental variable, something which either is present or is not, and represents the ability to the experimental results to deviate from chance. Evidence of the nature of psi requires more detailed experiments, where more information is present. "

Psi is the variable assumed, indeed.. but it's merely that, Raf; an assumption. It's affirmation by consequence. Logical Fallacy. Quite true about preliminary experimentation with subatomic particles, but the same should hold true in the case of so-called psi and other paranormal claims, by the same vein: if someone wrote a book and ran about touting such preliminary evidences as fact of subatomic particles, they'd have been ridiculed the same way Radin is.

Quote

"I think next we should argue the existence of string cheese, followed immediately by discarding any possibility of a human being possessing a gallon of milk.

All the scientific data on earth to the contrary could never convince a person who knows he has seen the things he has, and has in fact shared such experiences with multitudes of people, that the contrary opinion could in any shape or form be remotely correct. As I mentioned before your strange infatuation with scientific evidence and the likes is really quite wasted, and you should look into trying to get some of the time back you threw away while gathering it all. I'm surprised you're still having at it, but I suppose everyone needs something to do. In the end, however, you're really only having a discussion with Kobok, and in so far as everyone else is concerned you can only fail at what you may be trying to do. " -Prophecy

The fallacy there is the acceptance that what one thinks they've seen, under non-controlled conditions, is what's actually occurred. By this same philosophy, you would visit a stage magician and actually believe the person called up has been magically sawed in half, and is otherwise not harmed or injured, or that coins are really being pulled from your ears, and so on. Yet you don't, I'd imagine. When you go to the movies, you don't confuse what you're seeing, video footage of a murderer possessed by devils or something, stabbing people, to be actually happening, even though to a person from a more primitive time might well see the same in a theater and mistake it for a hole in the air through which they're seeing something actually occurring

in real time, or a vision in the darkness. Neither do I consider killing some time at work in this debate to be an utter waste, as I've learned more about some of the pressing materials out there that people might cling to as support of psychic or magickal hooplah.

I've known from the onset however that I won't be convincing anyone here to give up their fantasies. I'd be about as successful pointing out reality in these instances as I would on a board dedicated to any religion; you can't use reason or fact to make people give up Faith. All I'm doing here, is illustrating that (as by your comment about KNOWING something is true despite facts or evidence to the contrary on account of personal experience), such things are matters of faith, purely, and not realistic at all. If they were real, someone would step up to any of the NUMEROUS organizations that offer ludicrous sums of money and easy living for the rest of one's life, in exchange for demonstration of powers in such a controlled setting.

In the end, there's no harm in make-believing any of this, aside from the wastings of your own time, talking about it like it's real and so forth. I'm just glad there's now something in the site that some potential questioner might stumble upon, early into it, and find some light to reason before getting entangled in all this stuff.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:38:52 PM by MachineChimera » Logged

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1064

Karma: 24

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #110 on: July 19, 2006, 01:37:10 PM »

I think you didn't understand what I just said. I said, psi IS the Unknown cause. There aren't any inherent assumptions made about psi. We have simply named the unknown factor psi. The fact of the matter is, by some unknown mechanism, the results have deviated from chance. We named that mechanism psi. Now, there reason why they point at "psychic" abilities is because that would appear to be a "solution" which fits the bill. No one is say the results prove psychic abilities. The results prove that there exists a deviation from chance beyond that which is expected. Once more, that deviation itself, is psi. "Psions" as opposed to parapsychologists or members of other fields are only interested in coming to understand that deviation and how it might be controlled or amplified. Those of us who are looking for truth aren't being pretentious nutballs about it and assuming that it must be specific agents that it occurs. Instead, we devote our time to trying to figure by what agent we might be able to influence this deviation. Hence, you get wild theories and speculation, until we come to something

that fits the bill, and then we operate under the assumption that it may be the case, in so far that we are able to grow in understanding and influence with it.

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4743
Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #111 on: July 19, 2006, 02:09:35 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

An apt analogy for the issue, and especially helpful for my case. If the modulate the variable of the cheese being outside of the fridge by leaving it in, and it aged as quickly as the cheese left outside, the hypothesis that the cheese molds/ages faster depending upon the temperature of its surroundings would be unverified. You get the same results in the warm surroundings, as in the chilled/fridge.

You are correct that, if this happened, it would not provide support for the fridge helping cheese not get fuzzy, nor would this comparable result provide support for the existence of psi in a parapsychology study. However, this is not the result obtained in parapsychology studies. In the vast majority of parapsychology studies, especially the ones of significant size, the experimental run and the control run DO differ in the hypothesized direction. If you are trying to imply otherwise, I challenge you to show otherwise with evidence.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Quote

"You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely differently."

Oh? So then let's expand it beyond self-selected sample. Let's consider every single person that's ever won the lottery, and the astronomical odds against them. Let's calculate their combined success rate of 'beating chance' by winning the lottery from the time lottery tickets began sales, to present. Now, let's point to the deviation, and then

freely create a fantastical explanation for the apparent, unexplainable deviation from expected chance that's occurred. Those damn magical entities between space and time, up to their old tricks again.

This is what statisticians refer to as a "natural" experiment, and is still not a controlled experiment. Where is the control group? Without one, it is not a controlled experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

You don't seem to be getting it: The machine didn't run the deviations from chance without people being involved, in a control run. The RNG produced the deviation from chance far outside the expected, just by having people be involved in the test, without concentrating. Not intent, not focused on changing it's results. Just sitting in front of it, reading a magazine, daydreaming, etc.

I've said many many times, "changing only one variable". If you change multiple variables, then you can potentially measure multiple variables. In whatever hypothetical study you are quoting completely without reference, the variable changed was placing a person in front of an RNG or not between the experimental and the control run. Why placing a person in front of an RNG produces a change in a faraday isolated RNG is still something which warrants an explanation, but it is not a measurement of what is being discussed here. In controlled experiments, only one variable, the INTENT is varied, which means a participant is also sitting there for the control run.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Quote

"1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem."

Gladly. "In 1994 Bem and Honorton published a report in the prestigious journal Psychological Bulletin, bringing the research to the notice of a far wider audience. They republished Honorton's earlier meta-analysis and reported impressive new results with a fully automated ganzfeld procedure -- the Princeton autoganzfeld -- claiming finally to have demonstrated a repeatable experiment. Not long afterwards Wiseman, Smith, and Kornbrot (1996) suggested that acoustic leakage might have been possible in the original autoganzfeld. This hypothesis was difficult to assess after the fact because by then the laboratory at Princeton had been dismantled.

So according to the reference, three people who never saw the original setup proposed ten years after the experiment was run that there must have been acoustic leakage into the soundproof room, when the on-site examiners such as Daryl Bem (a psychologist who later coauthored a paper with Honorton 8 years later), and stage

magician and mentalist Ford Kross, who actually went to SEE the setup, concluded that it was secure. Kross wrote,

"In my professional capacity as a mentalist, I have reviewed Psychophysical Research Laboratories' automated ganzfeld system and found it to provide excellent security against deception by subjects."

I'll take that over a random speculation of two people who never looked at the site, but speculate that it "might have been" leaky somehow. This is quite a difference from your initial claim that they were known to be leaky.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Further, such flawed materials, even after such criticisms have been pointed out, and the tests yet further refined, are still being mentioned in compilations of 'evidence' by such as Radin, in his issue-riddled Conscious Universe.

You know not of what you speak. The Conscious Universe explicitly describes Hyman's criticism (pages 78-79) of the 20 out of 48 studies, and compares the analysis with or without them to assess the relevance of those criticisms to the significance of the effect. I told you at the beginning that he discusses essentially every prominently published criticism of the results he discusses, yet for some reason you continue to presume otherwise.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

What I should reasonably expect is that people get better at something with practice. Practice and improvement should not happen and be evident across the board between the first and second try, in the matter of a minute or less, especially without feedback on success or failure of the first attempt before the second is attempted. Practice generally provides improvement based upon noticing a previous failure, or technique that can be corrected, and then applying that correction of technique gained from the previous attempt's failure. The subjects in question had no means of knowing whether their previous guess had been success or failure when the image reappeared

Again, you are incorrect. If you read the publications about the ganzfeld protocol you will see that this is the case. The last step of every run is that the correct answer is revealed for feedback purposes, which is explicitly done so that participants can improve their skill with practice.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Negative. Saying you will make "as many baskets as you can" in a game is not a claim of an ability. It's a claim of intent. A test does not verify the absence or presence of intent. Stating "I will shoot 4 more baskets than I normally do" is a claim of ability. It can be tested.

And if you shoot 6 more baskets than you normally do, is that a success or failure? (That's not a rhetorical question, I expect you to choose one of those.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994).

Really? ONE lonely 1 more than chance in every thousand RNG outputs?

That sounds kind of small until you consider that the RNGs used typically output around 10 million bits per second. So that 0.1% corresponds to 10,000 more 1's every single second. I'd love to see the basketball player who could keep up. Wink

In the ganzfeld, however, where each run can sometimes take on the order of an hour or more, results are typically on the order of 32%-35% in comparison to 25% chance. If you could do that with a fair four-sided die without physical contact, it would be impressive...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Hawkings agrees with Einstein in regard to much of his gravitational theorem, and further the issue was that Determinism has not been proven anything, either wrong or right. It's still being pursued by many minds in the community, and is still a the rule for pretty much everything that's NOT quantum in science, primarily the natural sciences. And How did you come to conclude what Einstein's thoughts would probably be, were he alive today, on the subject?

Determinism is unrelated to general relativity. I didn't respond to that comment because it has no meaning. You are simply repeating your claim without basis that determinism is somehow accepted by "many" ambiguous minds, when I being a physicist have not seen that in physicists, nor learned that in my courses, nor read it in any modern textbooks. I have in fact, seen the opposite, learned the opposite in courses, and read the opposite in modern textbooks. So if you're going to make a crazy claim about determinism somehow being a presumption outside of philosophy, you're going to have to do better than "many minds".

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Mm. Well, if the RNG is truly a quantumly generated function, governed by quantum law, then knowledge of how it should behave will alter it's behavioral state, by your own admission. So you cannot possibly discern what is actual affect resulting from anyone's interaction with it based upon some ability or power, and what is simply resulting because of the person's knowledge of how the system will behave, alone. Sounds like an awful predicament to be in, frankly.

If this were true, then we would have our mechanism for psi. However, quantum mechanics as it is best known does not permit the passage of classical information via this method. The reasons why it does not permit the transfer of classical information require math which will not fit into the margins here.

However, I encourage you to find a means by which quantum mechanics permits a person to alter the result of a RNG by means of changing something inside his or her mind. If you succeed, you will have expanded the laws of physics to include the kineses you are trying to argue does not exist.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Obviously, I'm asserting it, so yes, do scan the page in question so we can all see the graph, and note when the spike in question begins to drop off, against the time the verdict was actually read.

Uh... I did. Read up to where I said "image of the page" and provided a link to the image of the page.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Going back to the PEAR experiments, I'll repost the following: "In 1987, Dean Radin and Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says "in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chance" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143). Nelson also claimed that there were no "star" performers."

REALLY? No star performers? They all did equally well across the board, that seems to imply. So then why do we find .. "the percentage of hits in the intended direction was only 50.02%" in the PEAR studies (Hyman 1989: 152). And one "operator" (the term used to describe the subjects in these studies) was responsible for 23% of the total data base. His hit rate was 50.05%. Take out this operator and the hit rate becomes 50.01%. According to John McCrone, "Operator 10," believed to be a PEAR staff member, "has been involved in 15% of the 14 million trials, yet contributed to a full half of the total excess hits" (McCrone 1994). According to Dean Radin, the criticism that there "was any one person responsible for the overall results of the experiment...was tested and found to be groundless" (Radin 1997: 221). His source for this claim is a 1991 article by Jahn et al. in the Journal of Scientific Exploration, "Count population profiles in engineering anomalies experiments" (5:205-32). However, Jahn gives the data for his experiments in Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World (Harcourt Brace, 1988, p. 352-353). McCrone has done the calculations and found that 'If [operator 10's] figures are taken out of the data pool, scoring in the "low intention"

condition falls to chance while "high intention" scoring drops close to the .05 boundary considered weakly significant in scientific results."

You are comparing Nelson's meta-analysis, done in 1996 using all the data generated until then, with meta-analyses done in 1987 and 1988. It should not surprise you that the one done in 1996 has data which was gathered in the intervening 8 or 9 years which is not included in the '87 and '88 meta-analyses. This is not "fraud" on the part of the '96 analysis or on those who quote it, it is simply that more data was available. Welcome to the world of science.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Further, you've repeatedly ignored various points of interest in this debate, such as Radin's blatant attempts at deception in his book, by misquoting people he claims are in agreement with his own findings.

Those claims of misquoting were made by the same individual who cannot read basic graphs or basic sentences. I have discussed them in previous threads, and do not feel like getting into them again. The argument of the critic is basically that Radin quotes people, without quoting everything they have ever said on the topic. At no point does Radin alter the contents of a quote. It's just that he quotes what he considers relevant to the topic he is discussing in each specific section. This is how quoting is done, and criticizing this has no scientific value.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Consider the following typical example. Radin points out that there were 186 publications on ESP card tests worldwide from 1882 to 1939. "The combined results of this four-million trial database [taken at face value]," he says, "translate into tremendous odds against chance--more than a billion trillion to one." (A 'trial' is the guess of one card) He means that the P value is about 10^{-21} --he is not writing only for the scientific establishment. This P value corresponds to a bulge above 'chance' expectation of 9.5 sigma, where sigma is the standard deviation. (I call that a 'sigmage' of 9.5.)

Apart from the possibility of conscious and unconscious fraud and wishful thinking in some fraction of the publications, Radin claims, with no explanation, that, in order to "nullify" the statistical significance, the file drawer would have to contain "more than 3,300 unpublished, unsuccessful reports for each published report". That number 3,300 is a gross overestimate. It should be reduced at least to about 15 (or even to 8).

The 15 or 8 is quite wrong. Allow me to show why. Look at this plot here:

<http://www.ltcconline.net/greenl/Courses/201/probdist/zScore2.gif>

The area under the normal curve in that plot represents all possible chance results. The shaded area is for a z-score of 1.82. A z score of 9.5, like you are discussing, would represent the area under the curve 5 times farther to the right on that graph. Now what you are proposing is that 186 publications in the area under the curve around

z=9.5 can be nullified by 8 or 15 other publications placed elsewhere in the curve, and then you will have the normal expected chance result yielding the shape of the normal curve. By simple spatial examination of the curve you can see how ridiculous this notion is.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

The logical fallacy here, it should be pointed out, is that of Affirming the Consequent.

"If it's psi, then the data deviate from chance. The data deviate from chance. So, it's psi. Or, if a person is psychic, that person will do better than chance in guessing experiments. That person did better than chance in a guessing experiment. Therefore, that person is psychic.)"

In a controlled experiment such as used during psi influence experiments, the reasoning is: "If only one variable changes between control runs and experimental runs, and the result deviates significantly, then the variable changed caused the resulting deviation."

This is classic and standard scientific reasoning. If you dispute this reasoning, either you are wrong, or the bulk of science must be discarded. I've noticed you don't like it when I conclude with statements like that, but when discussing very basic concepts like the reasoning used in a controlled experiment, then I'm afraid it IS true.

In a perception experiment, the comparison is to the chance result which would be obtained in the absence of any information. (For the case of perception, this cannot be obtained from changing a single variable because there is no rigorously observable way to turn "off" psi perception. This sources from the fact that for perception, the measurement is the answer reported by the participant, rather than the result reported by an external device, as in influence experiments. You cannot distract someone's attention, and simultaneously ask them what they guess that the answer is. The best you can do in this direction is to compare performance under focused conditions versus distracted conditions, in which you can show that the focused condition is far more successful.) Therefore, isolation and distance are used to eliminate classical means of communication. If you consider the actual experimental conditions, which have ranged from soundproof rooms with no physical items in contact, to distances of thousands of miles, then it is easy to see that classical means of communication are removed as an explanation. In this case, psi perception is defined as receiving knowledge through no classical or spatial means.

I have not responded to any ad hominem against parapsychologists. If you want to debate, debate on the merits of the evidence. I have no interest in discussing for hours on end whether or not you believe you can ridicule large numbers of scientists. Such ridicule has no scientific value.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 03:30:49 PM by kobok » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmodis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #112 on: July 19, 2006, 03:42:12 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM

The fallacy there is the acceptance that what one thinks they've seen, under non-controlled conditions, is what's actually occurred. By this same philosophy, you would visit a stage magician and actually believe the person called up has been magically sawed in half, and is otherwise not harmed or injured, or that coins are really being pulled from your ears, and so on. Yet you don't, I'd imagine. When you go to the movies, you don't confuse what you're seeing, video footage of a murderer possessed by devils or something, stabbing people, to be actually happening, even though to a person from a more primitive time might well see the same in a theater and mistake it for a hole in the air through which they're seeing something actually occurring in real time, or a vision in the darkness.

Wait, my entire life has been in non-controlled conditions! Cheesy Does that mean that I don't know anything that's happened? My memories are unverifiable? Oh no3z!

Seriously, though, I don't see your point here. Scientific studies are good in that they offer a formal procedure by which one can demonstrate to a distanced group of people that a phenomenon has occurred, but regular old experience is fine for those who actually get to experience the phenomena demonstrated. If I magically bend a spoon sitting in my house, that's pretty cool- and I can assume, based on seeing the spoon bend, that the spoon actually bent. Assuming that I'm the butt of some stage magician's prank, or that it's some crazy special effect, or that I'm actually in some Matrix-esque all-immersive VR movie would be... well, psychologically paranoid, really.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM

All I'm doing here, is illustrating that (as by your comment about KNOWING something is true despite facts or evidence to the contrary on account of personal experience), such things are matters of faith, purely, and not realistic at all. If they were real, someone would step up to any of the NUMEROUS organizations that offer ludicrous sums of money and easy living for the rest of one's life, in exchange for demonstration of powers in such a controlled setting.

Speaking of non-scientifically-controlled studies, those little contests prove little, in my

opinion. As was previously mentioned, the number of people who can reliably produce effects dramatic enough to win them a million dollars is presumably pretty small- we're not hiding some Harry Potter secret wizard world here. I'm not sure (and I mean no offense to anyone as I say this- I've just never bothered to find out >_>) that theres even anyone on this site who could, at will, produce a certain desired physical effect at any given time in non-ideal circumstances- which, as far as I've read of the contests, is just about what such tests would require. Oddly enough, I haven't seen the contests admitting a demonstration using a RNG.

Furthermore, just as a side-note, while I would be rather surprised to find a professional skeptic admit to the existence of psi under any circumstances (including being telekinetically thrown out a window Cheesy), I would be particularly surprised to find a professional skeptic admit to the existence of psi under circumstances in which it causes them to lose some vast sum of money. They become, due to the inherent nature of the contest, an interested party. Cheesy

In either case, don't let me disrupt this smashing arguement. The ability of both sides to find legions of citations awes me Smiley.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 03:45:11 PM by Zake » Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

DownRodeo

DD-APPROVED! A-OKAYH!!

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 498

Karma: -1

Veritas Furniture

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #113 on: July 19, 2006, 05:20:25 PM »

Quote from: Rafnul on July 19, 2006, 01:37:10 PM

I think you didn't understand what I just said. I said, psi IS the Unknown cause. There aren't any inherent assumptions made about psi. We have simply named the unknown factor psi. The fact of the matter is, by some unknown mechanism, the results have deviated from chance. We named that mechanism psi. Now, there reason why they point at "psychic" abilities is because that would appear to be a "solution" which fits the bill. No one is say the results prove psychic abilities. The results prove that there exists a deviation from chance beyond that which is expected. Once more, that deviation itself, is psi. "Psions" as opposed to parapsychologists or members of other

fields are only interested in coming to understand that deviation and how it might be controlled or amplified. Those of us who are looking for truth aren't being pretentious nutballs about it and assuming that it must be specific agents that it occurs. Instead, we devote our time to trying to figure by what agent we might be able to influence this deviation. Hence, you get wild theories and speculation, until we come to something that fits the bill, and then we operate under the assumption that it may be the case, in so far that we are able to grow in understanding and influence with it.

Well said sir. I do however feel that the volume of tests we can do in this area will never be enough to prove anything either way, we've just got to keep hammering away at it all to find out what really is going on, instead of making blind inferences based upon tests thats "some other dude" did Wink

« Last Edit: July 20, 2006, 05:59:32 AM by DownRodeo » Logged

"There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies on the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers... and you've got to make it stop!"

Mario Savio

Black

Black SnaX

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 253

Karma: 1

No Fixed Abode

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #114 on: July 23, 2006, 06:24:32 PM »

Been reading through, and I was about to post exactly what Rafnul just wrote...

Personally I dont care what has been proven or not, I dont pretend to understand exactly what mechanisms allow me to do some of the things that 'psi' can do, I have my theories, but I dont assume to know anything, proof or no proof. The fact remains that here are some things that I can do with 'psi' which consistantly work. I can 'build' something with my mind, give it all kinds of random proproties, and someone else who I've never even met can tell me what I did, right down to the details. This has happened hundreds of times so I am beyond wondering if its 'real' and now more interested in HOW it works, because it does, and the best way to increase the efficiency and utility of these abilities is to understand the mechanisms behind them.

If there are any arguments about the existence of these abilities, it should be what is and is not possible with 'psi', not about the existence of 'psi'.

Logged
Ominous Latin phrase
Grimmjow
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 162
Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism
« Reply #115 on: July 12, 2008, 01:26:17 AM »
I wonder what happened to MachineChimera...

I guess he couldn't argue anymore...

Anyone know what happened to him?

« Last Edit: July 12, 2008, 01:36:21 AM by Grimmjow » [Logged](#)

Steve
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3096
Karma: 64

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism
« Reply #116 on: July 12, 2008, 08:31:13 AM »
comes back inside from the backyard, covered in dirt and carrying a shovel

Uh, I guess he left town >_>

~Steve

Logged
Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of

training for a human: why not everything else?

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4743

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #117 on: July 12, 2008, 11:23:54 AM »

Quote from: Grimmjow on July 12, 2008, 01:26:17 AM

I wonder what happened to MachineChimera...

I guess he couldn't argue anymore...

Anyone know what happened to him?

According to his "last active" time, he returned at the appropriate time to read the replies to him posted here, and then gave up on responding.

This is not surprising, since he did not find what he expected to find here. He waltzed in thinking he had superior reasoning ability to everyone else, and that everyone else was lost in delusion. This was the basis for the majority of his argument, but it kept conflicting with reality. Ad hominem attacks against researchers do not get one very far. And there are only so many times one can argue about the basic principles of scientific experimentation and statistical analysis, when this information is all publicly available in textbooks.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #118 on: July 12, 2008, 01:53:50 PM »

He's probably... tried-up *zing*.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Grimmjow

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 162

Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #119 on: July 12, 2008, 01:56:14 PM »

I do like how he says he used to read into the occult or whatever as a teen and said he then became more "logical" and all that. I guess to him, reading occult stuff and never experimenting with it is enough to call it "illogical". But seriously, it's illogical for him to say something is not true without even experimenting with it. He only said he read things about the occult and whatnot; he never said he tried any of it. rolleyes

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 6 7 [8] 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.120.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 25 Apr 2013

Jul APR May

25

2010 2013 2014

About this capture
The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 24, 2013, 11:25:34 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207187 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18394 Members - Latest Member: - NEYTiffan Most
online today: 94 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ New level of skepticm 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «
previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9] Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticm (Read 15038 times)

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #120 on: July 12, 2008, 02:04:11 PM »

What brought you to this dusty thread?

His Myspace says he's married (when he was single before), and is still in the Marines. My guess is that he's caught up in real life stuff, and no longer cares enough to bother us further.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Grimmjow

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 162

Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #121 on: July 12, 2008, 02:07:15 PM »

Quote from: solstice on July 12, 2008, 02:04:11 PM

What brought you to this dusty thread?

His Myspace says he's married (when he was single before), and is still in the Marines. My guess is that he's caught up in real life stuff, and no longer cares enough to bother us further.

I was at the main page of the site and I searched in the significant topics thing and found this topic.

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9] [Print](#)

[« previous](#) [next »](#)

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=9311.0>

7 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014
Sep JUL Aug
18
2013 2014 2015

About this capture
The Veritas Society
*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.
Did you miss your activation email?
July 18, 2014, 02:16:00 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

214972 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most
online today: 115 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 Print

Author Topic: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier (Read 3633 times)

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« on: October 04, 2006, 10:44:03 PM »

For many years this community has exhibited a severe lack of proof regarding psionic skills and psionic methodologies. Capable psion after capable psion have made elaborately written excuses and reasons not to provide any kind of proof. However if you study any of these reasons closely enough, and eliminate all the bull, I believe it all boils down to one factor: We don't currently have any way to efficiently and convincingly provide this type of proof.

Let's face it: If we were all in person sitting in a room together, and one person claimed he could teach you how to spin a psiwheel, there would probably be a number of people who would ask him to show them his skill. The teacher would then probably have no problem proudly showing them a small demonstration not only because it would boost his self esteem but because it would intrigue everyone, increase their motivation and willingness to learn, demonstrate the proper way to perform the skill, and verify that he clearly has the credentials to teach them and won't waste their time. I know this from experience because this is the way people act regarding most skills in social situations in person and I don't believe psionics would be any different. Now take this same situation online. Suddenly everyone "doesn't have the equipment", "shouldn't have to waste their time for you", "isn't obligated to provide you with proof", "isn't going to do it because you probably won't believe it anyway", "can't prove it to you in a tangible way", or tells you "you'd be better off providing proof to yourself".

So why all the sudden has the willingness and enthusiasm to provide demonstrations gone away? Well you could formulate an infinite amount of excuses such as the ones listed above which can be easily argued against for the most part, or you could take a logical standpoint, view the larger picture, and realize the obvious truth right in front of you: It simply isn't nearly as easy to provide the proof to someone across the globe over a computer network as it is to physically provide the proof to the person right next to you. Instead of a quick 5 second demonstration you have a big hassle with getting the right equipment, setting it up, trying to perform in such a way that most of the environmental factors can be seen and eliminated, finding a place to publish your proof, and dealing with the inevitable group of people that will claim it was faked. In this situation most people simply don't find the effort to be worth the reward. It becomes a matter of either the person doesn't want to go through all the hassle or they don't have the capability/technology. However, in order to conceal selfishness or not present an image of incompetency, an unrelated excuse will probably be made up.

Now the purpose of this thread is not so I can rant and debate about people who don't give psionic proof - I've already done that enough in several other threads. Rather, I'd like to try to find a way for people to easily provide demonstrations. I want you to all put your heads to together and figure out how to break this hassle-barrier so a normal healthy education cycle which includes proof and demonstrations can be resumed. There has to be some way that someone who is competent can easily demonstrate their skills to the community and that anyone who has a skill will be passively encouraged to present it rather than feeling they have some sort of unwarranted demand placed on

them. The method by which this is done may not be apparent to us now (which makes demonstrations appear to be highly impractical), but I'm sure with enough brainstorming, discussion, and teamwork, we can figure something out. If you have any ideas please post them here and feel free to discuss the ideas of others.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #1 on: October 05, 2006, 01:08:44 AM »

I, too, have been a bit frustrated by the lack of proof, even though I have proven it to myself on multiple occasions, I could have saved myself alot of time making actual improvement rather than practicing kamehamehas. Even though I don't doubt the abilities of many people, I still really would have appreciated some more... "proven" methods of practice.

now, there are a few ways I would accept evidence as proof. I'd love a real, physical, right in front of me demo, but that's not likely to happen. a webcam would be my next choice. They're like what... 15 bucks? anybody with a USB port can use it. simple. The one problem with that is some people aren't willing to pay, and some people don't have a good enough internet connection to broadcast. The next would be a recorded video on youtube or myspace, but it would have to be way better than the ones currently on either of those sites. a free roaming camera is probably first on the list of things to have in your video. Makes doctoring really hard. Also, you would need to set up the control. so if you're doing a psi wheel demo, you need to have footage of it NOT MOVING, so that when it does move, you can claim it as your own doing. also, it must be in an airtight container to be really valid. Sure, people will still dispute it, but it's better than your standard open-air, can't see under the table thing.

If you're trying to demonstrate something other than PK, I'd suggest simple number

guessing. I did it with my brother once or twice when we were first starting out. I focused on a number between one and ten, and for awhile we were guessing with an alarming accuracy. Of course, we had to rely on the honor system.

Most people here on the forums use some form of instant messaging. a simple system can be set up with a three way conversation. Have one person be the middle man. the other two are "transmitting numbers" to eachother. so person A tells person C that the number is say, 6. Then person A transmits the number to person B, who will then say what they thought the number was. if B says 4, then A can't say "correct" because person C knows it was wrong. The three of them can tally up the numbers and write down the methods they used, and if enough people were to experiment with different methods and calculate the accuracy using them, then specific methods that bring about the most success could be pinpointed and elaborated on. I think that could be very beneficial to psi practitioners all over.

I'm no expert, but I don't think tangible and strong evidence is that difficult to attain, so I don't see why we shouldn't work to do a little bit for everyone.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #2 on: October 05, 2006, 10:30:46 AM »

Proving receptive abilities is straightforward (even moreso than if a bunch of people were just sitting in a room)- the teacher simply scans the student and tells him what he's wearing, what he had for breakfast, his environment, whatever. Something could easily be found which is variable enough to be decent proof. I'm pretty sure we have at least a few people around who claimed to have a reasonably reliable accuracy rate.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your

stillness.
kakkarot
0. The Fool... Inverted?
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701
Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #3 on: October 05, 2006, 10:43:14 AM »

The problem then falls on availability of accomplished practitioners who can provide proof versus the millions of people out there who want this proof. After even just a short time it becomes quite tedious and harrowing to have to provide proof for every Tom, Dick, and Jane who shows up on the forums or chat asking for (or simply demanding) proof that they're willing to accept.

How would this problem be dealt with? Simple pinwheel videos are already available via psipog and veritas, so what other solutions are there to a dozen people a day showing up and demanding real time undeniable proof?

EDIT: It seems even google video has some vids

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8786430663470284545&q=psi>

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: October 05, 2006, 10:46:29 AM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Big Boss
Friggen Crazy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1458
Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #4 on: October 05, 2006, 11:29:41 AM »

the problem with vids like that kak, is that they're too easy to doctor/fake. that one right there is a good example of a bad video because it was done in two shots. the first one with the water being poured out, and the second, where there was likely no water in the can and instead, a small magnet. That of course is my skeptical side. Smiley

The problem with scans, as Zake mentioned, is that hoards of people want them, and won't take a testimonial for an answer. Is there a way to make a testimonial more than a simple "yes, it's true."?

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

View Profile

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #5 on: October 05, 2006, 01:18:24 PM »

A high definition video, with an entire room in view, from 16 different camera angles, with a piece of paper inside of glass box melted shut on site and video taped, and submerged in water, thermometers kept in 24 different places in the water to monitor unusual activity. No human being can be in the same room as the toothpick and the glass case, including the psion. Room is closed after the filmed setup is completed. There must be cameras on all cameras so that we can see behind. The entire of stream of video must be uninterrupted for all cameras. An aerial thermograph should be taken for the entire period of the experiment as well. Psion must perform the experiment blind, or from behind a glass window .

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #6 on: October 05, 2006, 01:20:17 PM »

Therein lies the problem, as I mentioned: thousands of people want direct personal proof, merely dozens at veritas could/would provide it over such a flimsy medium as the internet.

As always, however, the best proof is the proof a person finds for themselves. If a person desires to learn to actually achieve these results, there are plenty of articles by kobok, prophecy, and others which tons of people have used to achieve their own personal proofs. If a person is just looking to cause trouble by claiming we can't provide proof, then let them claim all they want. I know what I do is real, I have no impetus to prove it to others. I learned on my own, others can learn as well (and unlike in my own life where I had no teacher yet still was able to learn, there are teachers here at veritas who are willing to teach people, and from whom many have been given more proof than they ever would have needed).

So if people want to still try to give individual, personal proof to every person that comes here, I'll not stop them. That's up to the individuals who wish to give such proofs. And good luck to you all, for if you succeed in your endeavors then you have taken a strong step forward.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #7 on: October 05, 2006, 02:05:54 PM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on October 05, 2006, 01:08:44 AM

If you're trying to demonstrate something other than PK, I'd suggest simple number guessing. I did it with my brother once or twice when we were first starting out. I focused on a number between one and ten, and for awhile we were guessing with an alarming accuracy. Of course, we had to rely on the honor system.

I've seen this type of evidence accumulated countless times around here. Many students of the psi courses have done similar, and I've seen a handful of people successfully doing similar exercises in the practice channel.

The question is, what good is it to those who are looking for proof? Does it help if we document it? Like you say, it requires the honor system. You could easily pm the answers and cheat if you were so inclined, so it only really works as "proof" to the people who are actually taking part in it, since they know they aren't cheating, or to those who trust them. So then it becomes a volume problem. Do you "guess the number" for a few hundred people a day as each person wants a personal demonstration?

There are only two ways I know of to package this sort of information for distribution to the masses. The first is to teach people how to do it so they can do it themselves. The second is scientific studies, which themselves require trusting the honesty of scientists, as with any science. If you find a third method, by all means, speak up.

Quote from: ThiefDeath

Rather, I'd like to try to find a way for people to easily provide demonstrations. ... There has to be some way that someone who is competent can easily demonstrate their skills to the community and that anyone who has a skill will be passively encouraged to present it rather than feeling they have some sort of unwarranted demand placed on them.

Quote from: Martial Thoughts

the problem with vids like that kak, is that they're too easy to doctor/fake.

Quote from: Rafnul

A high definition video, with an entire room in view, from 16 different camera angles, with a piece of paper inside of glass box melted shut on site and video taped, and submerged in water, thermometers kept in 24 different places in the water to monitor unusual activity. No human being can be in the same room as the toothpick and the glass case, including the psion. Room is closed after the filmed setup is completed. There must be cameras on all cameras so that we can see behind. The entire of stream of video must be uninterrupted for all cameras. An aerial thermograph should be taken for the entire period of the experiment as well. Psion must perform the experiment blind, or from behind a glass window.

That's the natural progression of thought that seems to go on with videos.

1. Video asked for, it's pointed out that webcams are cheap and easy.
2. Webcam video provided.
3. Video critiqued, many times with valid critiques, given the natural limit of information available with any video or demonstration setup.
4. Suggestion made for astronomically challenging conditions for a video of a demonstration.

And of course, if someone were to accomplish the conditions of number 4, number 3 would naturally repeat as a video or collection of videos can of course never address all possible criticisms. Many people simply skip step 2 since steps 3 and 4 are obvious.

As I wrote at the bottom of this page on our wiki, "In a modern society in which nearly anything can be rendered on screen in a large budget movie, videos alone cannot constitute proof. Therefore, these are not intended to be, nor presented as, proof. They are merely a few demonstrations provided in response to frequent request. These videos are presented with honest intent, and to the best of our knowledge they are genuine demonstrations of the stated abilities."

So in my opinion, the problem originates with what's asked for. So before you can brainstorm about how to gather "occult proof", you need to sit down and brainstorm what would constitute sufficient "occult proof" for the target audience.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #8 on: October 05, 2006, 03:11:55 PM »

Keep in mind I'm asking for ALL ideas on how to provide proof and demonstrations, not just recorded videos. Think outside the box.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Vecna

Heartless Admin

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 983

Karma: 11

The Silence Between the Void

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #9 on: October 05, 2006, 03:32:28 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 05, 2006, 03:11:55 PM

Keep in mind I'm asking for ALL ideas on how to provide proof and demonstrations, not just recorded videos. Think outside the box.

I'll encourage thinking outside the box, when I see evidence of thinking inside the box...

~Crowley

Logged

Arinil

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 347

Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #10 on: October 05, 2006, 06:04:59 PM »

Proof is indeed often necessary for those who wish to learn and need somewhat of a validation that what they will be spending their time and hard study on, but those who randomly appear and demand or even ask for proof have no need in my mind to be granted us wasting our time and effort to accommodate them. We should focus on proof for people who are sincerely interested in and have an at least basic belief of the things they are requesting proof of, which does not remotely suggest they have no skepticism on the subject; as blind belief is as harmful as blind denial. Anways...the point is that maybe the proof could be less sophisticated in some cases if some comprehension of the basic principals of what is occurring could further the understanding that the act is actually happening? This just opens the door for less traditional proof methods in my mind, and I thought hope my thoughts might prove helpful. Smiley

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #11 on: October 06, 2006, 08:08:53 AM »

Well when I get some noticeable skill (I'm working on some basic Clairvoyance tricks right now) I'll gladly do a webcam group session with people.

Logged

The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.
I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

vortex
Settling In
*

Posts: 12
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #12 on: November 01, 2006, 11:33:20 AM »

Sorry guys, but i think that skepticism will rule over those methods. Watch the example of free energy, we already have devices capable of producing it but, since there is no scientific explanation for the process , it's totally dismissed (except by the American army). <--See the documentary Equinox free energy , broadcasted in 1995, or do some research on Tesla.

So I'm tackling the problem from a different point of view, can the human brain deal with other kinds of energy not counting electrical?

I am currently taking higher electronics, with special interest on magnetic and electrical fields, with intentions on continuing with neuro-technology to see if this is the case.

And even if it can you would still have to prove how.....

The infamous Vericow!

Logged
Ephemeral
Settling In
*

Posts: 32
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #13 on: November 23, 2006, 12:40:26 PM »

I know this may sound a bit outlandish, but I have the most obvious solution to eliminating all skepticism. Host a all day meeting somewhere, and invite people from the veritas community. Those who are nearby will come, and we can have a seminar where people demonstrate their abilities, and key leaders like kobok and prophecy can lecture or explain different magick/psi techniques. There are obvious problems with this idea, namely travel distance. However, it's worth considering.

Logged

<http://www.philosophy-forums.com>

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 627

Karma: 15

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #14 on: November 23, 2006, 03:49:05 PM »

As great as that idea sound, I think it should wait a few years. Wink

Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

Pages: [1] 2 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=9415.0>

6 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

18

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 18, 2014, 02:18:09 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214972 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most online today: 115 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Psionic Proof Compilation 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: Psionic Proof Compilation (Read 3724 times)

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Psionic Proof Compilation

« on: October 21, 2006, 01:03:52 PM »

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Everyone who knows of a link to a good video, a scientific document, a large convincing argument, or anything else which could be considered proof of psionics, regardless of whether or not it could be called fake (unless you know it IS fake), please post it here.

« Last Edit: October 21, 2006, 01:11:33 PM by ThiefDeath » Logged
[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange
[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #1 on: October 21, 2006, 03:06:41 PM »

Trial and experience.

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 316

Karma: 0

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #2 on: October 21, 2006, 03:55:19 PM »

How exactly do you refer people to that Forg?

The telekinesis videos here on Veritas are pretty good. On a more scientific level, Dean Radin presents a pretty convincing statistical case, but I don't know how much will be available on line.

Logged
ChezNips
Veritas Teacher
Teacher Emeritus
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722
Karma: 7

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #3 on: October 21, 2006, 04:26:28 PM »

I would point people to R.J. Rhine and his work at Duke university that put psi on the proverbial map.

<http://www.rhine.org/>

Jessica Utss paper on The Paranormal: the Evidence and its Implications for Consciousness

<http://www.tcm.phy.cam.ac.uk/~bdj10/psi/tucson.psi>

Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research:

<http://www.princeton.edu/~pear/>

Biomind Superpowers:

<http://www.biomindsuperpowers.com/>

<http://www.rviewer.com/IngoSwann-ResearchOverview.html>

I could probably list another dozen if you needed

There are some names in particular that have done research for many years including Russell Targ and Hal Puthoff

http://www.parapsych.org/members/h_puthoff.html

Various random links for psi research:

<http://moebius.psy.ed.ac.uk/>

<http://www.noetic.org/>

Logged
some days you're the bug, some days you're the windshield.

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #4 on: October 21, 2006, 04:31:08 PM »

Quote from: Philosopher on October 21, 2006, 03:55:19 PM

How exactly do you refer people to that Forg?

By simply presenting them that they can try the material they find in order to see if it works for them.

Currently I don't have any outside videos other than the ones we have on the site, and I don't have very many links to parapsychology material and statistics. And outside of that, I'm not quite sure how to post 'proof' for the many abilities that don't have a physical counterpart outside of an observational answer.

« Last Edit: October 21, 2006, 04:33:33 PM by Forg » Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #5 on: October 21, 2006, 05:27:39 PM »

Most likely if a skeptic, someone practicing radki, or someone who is considering whether or not to start psionics asks me for proof that psionics works, "try it yourself" isn't going to be a very convincing answer. These people are looking to see something BEFORE they commit the long hours to studying and practicing. Some of the people I discuss this subject may not even be interested in practicing psionics themselves at all, so the possibility that they could achieve results themselves would be irrelevant. I'm looking for objective evidence. Objective evidence may not be possible for ALL psionic skills but it is possible for many and I'm looking for as much as I can get.

Thank you Star and Philosopher.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

ShadowStriker

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 228

Karma: 0

All Around WTF

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #6 on: October 21, 2006, 08:46:14 PM »

well, i think you should tell them where to find a really powerful Psion, have them go over there, have them us PK to rise a soda can up and smack em upside the head. I know its not a likely thing to happen, but it'd be funny as hell grin

Logged

The Strong Take From the Weak, The Smart Take From The Strong, The Quick Take From The Smart, And The Weak Rise Up Against Them All

Kettle

Frequent poster

Veritas Teacher

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 376

Karma: 20

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #7 on: October 21, 2006, 09:21:10 PM »

Quote

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Ya, that came out in 97' and it's called 'The Concious Universe : The scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena' by Dean Radin which basically does exactly what you are wanting to do. It's all very well put together too, presenting a solid basis behind the reality of psychic phenomena.

It's not a 'how to' guide, but but it contains some fairly undeniable evidence.

That should basically cover it.

-k

Logged

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #8 on: October 22, 2006, 07:25:21 AM »

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Athiril

Reverend Lucious

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 469

Karma: 0

View Profile WWW

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #9 on: October 22, 2006, 07:31:14 AM »

Quote from: Raitaro on October 22, 2006, 07:25:21 AM

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

it'd be impossible, because whatever you do could be scripted.

Logged

photodan.com.au

Forg

The V' Smithy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827
Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #10 on: October 22, 2006, 07:49:53 AM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 21, 2006, 05:27:39 PM

Most likely if a skeptic, someone practicing radki, or someone who is considering whether or not to start psionics asks me for proof that psionics works, "try it yourself" isn't going to be a very convincing answer. These people are looking to see something BEFORE they commit the long hours to studying and practicing. Some of the people I discuss this subject may not even be interested in practicing psionics themselves at all, so the possibility that they could achieve results themselves would be irrelevant. I'm looking for objective evidence. Objective evidence may not be possible for ALL psionic skills but it is possible for many and I'm looking for as much as I can get.

Thank you Star and Philosopher.

Yes, which is why I mentioned the evidence that comes simply from a question and answer point of view that would be provided via telepathy, psychic reading, scanning, remote viewing and so forth. In such circumstances when needed I would provide evidence using my own ability to the questioner. But I don't think a video including any of such things would be of much proof considering how easy it is to say that it's fake. The best evidence I've ever seen is on a one to one basis, statistical study, and a few TK videos. Now TK in general can be good proof, but I find it to be one of the most useless skills. That becomes a problem when people start asking, "Okay, so what's the point?"

In either case, what I can provide is only a tk video, my own experience on a personal basis, and encouraging people who want to know to 'waste their time' if the answers aren't going to pop up in front of them. Frankly, if people aren't willing to give their time to see such proof, I don't think it's all to important that they find it.

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #11 on: October 22, 2006, 10:39:50 AM »

<http://vsociety.net>

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #12 on: October 22, 2006, 11:14:14 AM »

http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/articles/pdf/13.1_kress.pdf Probably one of the
most important reports you'll see regarding the existence of Remote Viewing (which the
report terms "anomalous cognition"), "the Kress Report". It owns up to the fact that the
CIA was testing to see whether RV exists, and concludes that while RV does exist it is
not reliable enough to be used as a form of intelligence gathering. There was another
report done by two others who supposedly critiqued the StarGate project as well, but
those two didn't have the full access to the classified documents that Kress did.

http://www.irva.org/papers/ParaIntel_Kress.html Another place to find it, in html for

those without pdf readers.

Many good sources of information are found in books that aren't on the internet, such as "Psychic Discoveries Behind the Iron Curtain" and the followup book to that, the title of which I don't remember (something like "More Psychic Discoveries blah blah etc").

And then of course there's always, as forg said, trial and experience. learning to do these things for yourself will always trump research that other people did/do in terms of showing a person whether it's real or not.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #13 on: October 23, 2006, 10:07:43 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 21, 2006, 01:03:52 PM

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Everyone who knows of a link to a good video, a scientific document, a large convincing argument, or anything else which could be considered proof of psionics, regardless of whether or not it could be called fake (unless you know it IS fake), please post it here.

Proof (aka, substantially solid evidence of a sufficient caliber to not be reasonably disputable): <http://vsociety.net/wiki/Parapsychology>

Particular emphasis should be given to the content of "The Conscious Universe". If attempting to construct such a site in a comprehensive fashion, it would be wise to read

that book thoroughly and use its content as a guide to the distribution of evidence available. In particular, if one is searching for original data, this bibliography from said book is a reasonably comprehensive guide of data up to 1997:
<http://www.deanradin.com/NewWeb/TCUbiblio.html>

Reasonable demonstration, with clarifiers about the non-scientific nature of such demonstrations: <http://vsociety.net/wiki/Videos>

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Arinil

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 347

Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #14 on: November 21, 2006, 05:32:20 PM »

Quote

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

With precognition, if you control it to a sufficient caliber, you could possibly use this idea to make a "proof" video.

Film as many things as you can that prove it is the day you say it is (a.k.a. The date on the TV) so that the fact it is the time and day you say it is is completely undeniable. Make a prediction of something major that will happen the next day (cannot be anything that could be scientifically predicted such as weather, and preferably not something that is a 50/50 chance) and record yourself predicting it in the same video as the proof of the date. If it happens the next day record the proof of the date and the thing that happened.

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

Pages: [1] [Print](#)

« previous next »

[Jump to:](#)

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Miscellaneous_Debates

19 captures

6 Sep 2008 - 7 Aug 2017

Oct AUG Sep

07

2014 2017 2018

About this capture

Miscellaneous Debates

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Guide to Debating by TakeV

Eugenics

Category: Significant Forum Topics

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 15:52. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=10767.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug
17
2011 2014 2015

About this capture
The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.
Did you miss your activation email?
July 17, 2014, 01:21:57 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

214924 Posts in 15320 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) 0 Members and 1 Guest
are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 Print

Author Topic: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) (Read 4112
times)

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

View Profile

V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« on: July 01, 2007, 03:32:34 PM »
Foreword

Lately, there seems to have been a great increase in the amount of debating going on. This is a wonderful thing. A debate is not just convincing the other person that you are right, it is the exchange of ideas, viewing other viewpoints, learning facts that you may have not known previously. By using logic, reason, experience, and research, two people (as well as anyone observing) may approach one another, and leave more enriched than before.

However, this is not the case I have been observing. What I have seen is more close to arguing, with little learning going on, and all that results is inflation and defense of egos, contempt for others (and even going as far as contempt for the system the other person follows), and tempers being raised. This is quite a sad thing indeed; so much potential for growth is lost due to people simply not understanding the mechanics of how to debate in the first place.

This is the reason I have written this. I shall highlight some things I have seen going wrong. The topics will range from general debate practices, to more specific things within the occult.

The V guide to debates
(Or how to not sound like an idiot)

1. Logic

Logic

A link describing what logic is. Good background, if you need it, and you can learn about the different types of logic.

Logical Fallacies

A site describing logical fallacies. Read it. Know them like the back of your hand. Avoid at all costs, and try to correct anyone else who makes them.

Logic is, quite frankly, the backbone of any debate. It is the map we use to reach our destination of understanding what the hell we are talking about. Now, the main problem here is one of two things. One, some don't understand logic very much, and two, some think that the occult is beyond logic. The second point is quite understandable, as we have often, in our early childhood and exposure the media, get

bombarded with the idea that magic and psi have no rules, you can do whatever you want.

Well, not exactly. You see, it turns out that both do have rules, and logic can still apply. So, I recommend that everyone here gets a firm, solid understanding of logic and reason.

2. Respect

Okay. You just got your argument shot down. Despite having what you thought, you're point is not as concrete as you wanted it to be. Everyone is informing you that you are wrong.

What do you do?

- a) Proclaim the they are too far below your level to understand.
- b) Break out your full vocabulary of less than polite words.
- c) Nod and say you understand.
- d) Criticize one of their character traits.

(Answer: C)

Respect is an important thing in a debate. Simply, if you are too busy yelling or mocking your opponent, you are not spending any time debating. Additionally, this will hurt your public opinion, which may not seem big at first, leads to devastation in future debates. This is due to the fact that someone who is more advanced is going to have greater self-control. If this is lacking, it is not a good indicator of your credibility. And people will just hate you.

3. Sources

If you are going to use a point that is not in the realm of common knowledge, you had better back up your point. Again, this is just common sense, but a mistake I see often. If you are going to claim that psi energy is really made out of pink yogurt, and constructs are really sprinkles, you are going to need someone to back you up. The best way to approach this would be to have sources on hand, or easily accessible. Make sure the source is credible, thus you should avoid geocities, tripod, and the like.

Yet don't think that sources have to be so far removed. Kobok, for instance, is an authority on psionics, and he knows his way around a physics equation or two. He may be cited as a source for psionics and physics, though he needs to have actually stated what you are saying, or needs to be asked during the debate.

4. You lose, good day sir!

Yes, that quote was mandatory. But it brings us to the next point: That is the attitude of people who argue around here. A very wrong way to look at things, though.

The goal of a debate isn't to prove that you know more than someone else, or to convince them to adopt your side. Sharing ideas, that is the goal of a debate. Look at it this way, if you enter a proper debate, either way you have won. If you have "lost", then that means you have learned something new. If you have "won", you have helped someone learn something new. Both sides benefit from hearing the points of the other side, and both benefit from seeing the other side's view.

5. Occam's razor

Often stated as "The simplest solution tends to be the most correct one."
However, I've always believed the original statement to be more true --

"Entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity."

All this means is don't make things more complicated than they need be. Try to stay on topic, and try not to confuse the matter by adding unnecessary points to your argument. You could be telling someone the answers to life, the universe, and everything (In non-numerical form), and if they don't understand what you are saying, nothing is gained.

6. Common sense?

I really, really don't want to bring up this point, especially after the previous entireties, however, it must be stated.

Just because something defies common sense doesn't mean it is false. An excellent example of this in action is quantum mechanics, if you need proof. This is an important thing to remember in both magic and psionics. If something is false according to common sense, it does not necessarily mean it is false in reality.

7. Missing the forest for the trees

This is a case of not seeing the big picture for minor, inconsequential details. Remember, false facts can be stated, but unless they are going to affect the debate, just ignore them. An example, if I were to say "India, a country in Africa, has one of the largest populations on earth." Now, the topic here is what countries have high populations. Thus, the statement "a country in Africa", while false, is off topic and can be ignored. However, if I were to say "India, a country in Africa, has a large population because it is located in Africa", knock yourself out.

For more examples of this, just observe Faijer just about anytime he talks. Wink

8. Missing the trees for the forest

The inverse of the above, but also a problem. This is what happens when someone only focuses on the big picture of something, but the topic of the debate is

about the details of it. The best example I can give here is a personal experience.

Once, I had a debate with someone, who we shall call Mr. solstice. Myself and Mr. solstice were debating about the mechanics of magic, and how they compare to the mechanics of psionics. However, there was a problem here. Mr. solstice kept refuting my points with one point.

"Magic and psi are nothing alike because the lifestyles of a magician and a psion are nothing alike!"

Well, this does tend to be true, I have met few magicians and psions who have like lifestyles. However, the problem was, this was a moot point. How the practitioners live does not change how the mechanics of a system work. The principle of vibration holds if a magician is the CEO of a large corporation or if he is a hermit.

9. Subjectivity and reality

Don't.

Just, do not go there. By starting to throw in words like subjectivity, you must have a valid point, and you must know what you are doing. Here is a little exercise, I like to call it the "V test of relevance."

Imagine you are walking down the street, and all of a sudden, some random really strong guy comes and starts beating the bajeezes out of you. Unfortunately, all you have to defend yourself if your point. This guy is relatively intelligent, and not subject to trickery. You must use your point in a logical and reasonable train of thought to save yourself. If you can't do it, don't bring it up. If you argue that the guy doesn't exist, because your point is that nothing exists, you lose automatically.

Remember, we don't care how you twist words to make it seem like you are showing the nature of the universe.

Also avoid questions such as --

"What is true?"

"What is real?"

"Do you all exist?"

10. Most importantly (In my opinion)

Know that you can be wrong.

Remember, there is a 50/50 chance of it.

Conclusion

Well, that is about it. If I think of anymore, I will add it to the post.

I hope people will read this, and make good use of the information. Remember, a debate should be seen as a great thing, not as a headache. Smiley

« Last Edit: July 23, 2007, 09:47:27 PM by Frozen » Logged

Sigil for focus

Best argument ever.

Jesse9209

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 413

Karma: 20

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #1 on: July 01, 2007, 03:56:57 PM »

I hope people put those points into practice here. Good Article.

Logged

www.thedivinescience.org

Saer

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 480

Karma: 3

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #2 on: July 01, 2007, 08:16:16 PM »

Bless your soul for this.

Logged

As you love your own body, so regard everyone as equal to your own body. When the Supreme Experience supervenes, everyone's service is revealed as one's own service. Call it a bird, an insect, an animal or a man, call it by any name you please, one serves

one's own Self in every one of them. ~ Ma
solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #3 on: July 01, 2007, 08:31:51 PM »

Quote

Logic is, quite frankly, the backbone of any debate.

I think may have missed something,

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reason#Reason_and_logic

Reasoning is often confused with logic, and tends to be exercised more than logical deduction; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inductive_reasoning

« Last Edit: July 01, 2007, 08:35:04 PM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #4 on: July 01, 2007, 09:50:26 PM »

Quote from: TakeV on July 01, 2007, 03:32:34 PM

Kobok, for instance, is an authority on psionics, and he knows his way around a physics equation or two. He may be cited as a source for psionics and physics, though he needs to have actually stated what you are saying, or needs to be asked during the debate. Keep in mind that even though kobok may be cited as a source, just as anything can be cited as a source, that doesn't mean that what was cited can be used as a fact. kobok is just a man (we think), and is subject to his fallacies. Not much of what he teaches has actually been proven as a fact. Carry this concept for all figures of authority and knowledge as well.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3289

Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #5 on: July 01, 2007, 11:24:58 PM »

Good article.

~Steve

Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #6 on: July 02, 2007, 09:56:11 PM »

loved it. since as far back as i can remember, I've always been annoyed by people that can't accept that they might be wrong once in life. they'll argue for hours, knowing they are wrong, and keep arguing, cause of what? pride? reputation? all useless in the end. just be honest with yourself and others. fixes alot of things.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Darkrain

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 56

Karma: 0

View Profile WWW

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #7 on: July 03, 2007, 09:19:44 AM »

Bravo..... gimme V tongue

Logged

THE HOMEWORK NEVER ENDS-It's a rolling dream, What I'd like to go after

Even if tomorrow turns pale I shall get it and show you

It's a rolling dream, What I'd like to go after

If you stop it will get away, It's a matter of not losing heart

It's a rolling dream.....

Believe

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #8 on: July 23, 2007, 12:27:00 AM »

Hmmm, that is a problem. Not easy to access, is it?

Logged

Sigil for focus

Best argument ever.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #9 on: July 23, 2007, 04:34:07 AM »

Quote from: Saer

Bless your soul for this.

Aye...

This helps much. Perhaps the quality of debates on Veritas will change now.

Namaste

Logged

Frozen

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1072

Karma: 0

Posting chief

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #10 on: July 23, 2007, 09:39:08 PM »

Perhaps the best article to pass through here in a while.

I shall now proceed to change my name and move to Australia to avoid being slowly tortured to death by XIII and Gemini.

Logged

* chirss was kicked by kobok (Denny Crane)

I CARVE EVERYTHING YOU SAY INTO MY LEFT ARM!

~ V

<ShoresofPluto> how often do u ignite fires with ur mind?

<kobok> On occasion.

[20:06] <kobok> XIII: You wear your girlfriend's pants??

[20:06] <XIII> kobok: On occasion.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #11 on: July 23, 2007, 09:57:42 PM »

Frozen, I said something like this to ThiefDeath once-upon-a-time: I (sometimes) totally hate it when you're right.

Good job, TakeV, and thanks for posting!

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Winds mover001

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 103

Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #12 on: July 24, 2007, 05:58:21 PM »

Good point, excellent article.

Let's also not forget that people come to Veritas to learn. Learning and educating can be nerve wrecking, and everyone learns from each other. Let's hope everyone realizes their own educated experiences may come across to others in another way, than their learning experience did.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #13 on: July 28, 2007, 05:43:15 PM »

Here's something else interesting to add; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecological_fallacy

That seems to be a common error made by so-called skeptics, among other things.

You guys should probably learn to recognize these kinds of error, in the event that you are confronted about why you choose to live a metaphysical life.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #14 on: July 31, 2007, 10:15:23 AM »

Bravo TakeV

Every point is valid and should be studied with great focus by everyone who is wrong

cough. Nice job Smiley

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Pages: [1] 2 [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C10767.15.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 26 May 2013

Jul MAY Jun

26

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

May 26, 2013, 03:16:28 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

207897 Posts in 14770 Topics by 18477 Members - Latest Member: - PennyTyne
Most online today: 66 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) 0 Members and 2 Guests
are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author Topic: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) (Read 3781
times)

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1065

Karma: 25

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #15 on: August 01, 2007, 02:24:43 PM »

Good Luck getting people to follow this one.

Logged

queen of the south

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 526

Karma: 1

WTF?????

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #16 on: August 13, 2007, 11:39:27 AM »

I Stand naked and ashamed-everything that could be said has been said,so Ill just add this:THANX for the not so gentle shove in the right direction grin

Logged

Changing your mind will change the world,World
peace,Love,Happiness,Health,Abundance-these things are obtainable right here,right
now.

Pages: 1 [2] [Print](#)

« [previous](#) [next](#) »

[Jump to:](#)

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple
Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=6825.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 01:53:53 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214926 Posts in 15321 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 12172 times)

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Eugenics

« on: November 07, 2005, 06:33:30 PM »

Okay...I will try this thread again...hopefully my computer will not crash just as I finish, making me redo it again.

So, yesterday, among other things, Kobok and I touched upon the subject of Eugenics, its ethics and practicality.

I for one, think that Eugenics needs to be put into practice. Criminals for instance, obviously need to be fixed to prevent their tainted seed from remaining in the gene pool. Actually, criminals are the only ones that this needs to be put into practice with. Such things as murder and rape are inherently bad in of themselves, and are detrimental to society, giving nothing back. Thus, it is for the benefit of society to purge the genepool of such things.

So...thoughts?

Logged

ShiningDragon

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #1 on: November 07, 2005, 07:40:46 PM »

Your assuming that behavior such as murder are genetic and not learned characteristics. I believe that most of who we are is from our genes, but we still pick up on behavior during our childhoods which lead to different types of criminals.

Logged

"The church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church." - Ferdinand Magellan

And you shall cry tears of crimson...

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #2 on: November 07, 2005, 07:47:09 PM »

Quote

Your assuming that behavior such as murder are genetic and not learned characteristics. I believe that most of who we are is from our genes, but we still pick up on behavior during our childhoods which lead to different types of criminals.

You are assuming such things are learned behavior and not genetic.

Let us take the two scenerios and see which is better:

Such crime does have a genetic reason - The ellimination of a reason for such things. As well, it acts as a deterrent. In the case of males, a lower amount of testosterone will cause a decrease in anger, and sexual urge.

Such crime does not have a genetic reason - It still acts as a deterrent. It still causes a decrease of anger and so on.

One cannot be certain of a genetic reason, however it is certain that some people are predisposed to be criminals. We know this, although it is...possible...that it is simple an enviromental factor, but I find it unlikely. Thus, the best option either way is to fix them.

Logged

Falcon

Vretsa Dcitoinray

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 702

Karma: 1

Veritas Mentor

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #3 on: November 07, 2005, 07:57:56 PM »

I used to agree with this but, I no longer do, After all, trying to wipe them out won't work because there already in there, it's how trhe person is brought up that effects the way they are.

Logged

Finding some things difficult and need a extra hand, Apply for a mentor that's what were here for <http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=9706.0>

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #4 on: November 07, 2005, 08:03:43 PM »

Hence the "fixing" in order to prevent any new ones coming about. I do not advocate killing them, after all, they would be so usefull as slaves to the state.

Let us not let this turn into a nature VS nurture debate.

Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #5 on: November 07, 2005, 08:07:03 PM »

First of all, there is a bit in the (American) constitution against "cruel and unusual punishment" (...stay on topic, people!).

I don't think nature vs nurture has to be debated as such; the following should seem pretty obvious. Criminals, even serious ones, are, by and large, normal people; they aren't strange inhuman monsters, as much as we'd like them to be. That environmental aspects play a large role in making criminals criminal is probably more or less beyond doubt- I'm sure more poor kids living in gang-controlled ghettos end up more likely to commit serious crimes than rich kids living in the suburbs. Similarly, its well accepted that most everyone has the capacity for serious crimes- I don't have references off-hand, but various trials and tests and simple experience have shown that the average Joe can be pretty nasty when faced with the right (or, more likely, wrong) circumstances. Attempting to link criminal tendencies to genes is much like trying to link an appreciation for nature to genes; it may have an effect, though environment counts for alot.

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited. Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Falcon

Vretsa Dcitoiray

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 702

Karma: 1

Veritas Mentor

View Profile WWW

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #6 on: November 07, 2005, 08:10:33 PM »

well people like that do act like animals yes, I'd say take away the children from then and give them a different way of life, away from violence and abuse etc

Logged

Finding some things difficult and need a extra hand, Apply for a mentor that's what were here for <http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php?topic=9706.0>

Zankuro

Trasholin Can Fu Master

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 394

Karma: 0

"DD APPROVED! A-OKAYH"

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #7 on: November 07, 2005, 08:15:49 PM »

...Brave New World much?

Plenty of supposedly "bad" people have reformed and "seen the light", so to speak.. going on to become productive and helpful people.

Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnecessary; that's essentially what it already is.

And testosterone doesn't mean anything unless the impulses it inspires are acted on.. these male and female hormonal stereotypes have always annoyed me. Unless an individual is truly insane or sufficiently retarded, they are technically free to act on any thought or impulse and are responsible for their actions, whatever their family history.

Logged

If your heart is large enough to envelop your adversaries, you can see right through them and avoid their attacks. And once you envelop them, you will be able to guide them along the path indicated to you by heaven and earth.

~Morihei Ueshiba

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #8 on: November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM »

Quote

First of all, there is a bit in the (American) constitution against "cruel and unusual punishment" (...stay on topic, people!).

There is no universal idea of "cruel and unusual."

Quote

I don't think nature vs nurture has to be debated as such; the following should seem pretty obvious. Criminals, even serious ones, are, by and large, normal people; they aren't strange inhuman monsters, as much as we'd like them to be. That environmental aspects play a large role in making criminals criminal is probably more or less beyond doubt- I'm sure more poor kids living in gang-controlled ghettos end up more likely to commit serious crimes than rich kids living in the suburbs. Similarly, it's well accepted that most everyone has the capacity for serious crimes- I don't have references off-hand, but various trials and tests and simple experience have shown that the average Joe can be pretty nasty when faced with the right (or, more likely, wrong) circumstances. Attempting to link criminal tendencies to genes is much like trying to link an appreciation for nature to genes; it may have an effect, though environment

counts for alot.

Enviromental reasons play a part, but it is very likely that genetics do too. For instance, one who is genetically predisposed to anger may end up committing murder much more easy than one who is not. Thus, it is best for society to get rid of such things. Anger does nothing in such large quantities for society.

We know that many murderers do in fact, have an enlarged gland in their brain (I do not know which one it is offhand) that does what I said, causes a predisposition towards anger. This is bad. It needs to be gotten rid of.

Quote

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

Maybe to you. I find it very mercifull.

Quote

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited. Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Or...we can purge the genepool of such unwanted things in the first place, rather than aborting children. And this is in fact, outright eunegics, just like what I advocate. My way is better, as it does not do anything untill somebody has actualy done something, rather than just assuming that just because they have one gene, they will be evil. (one may have another gene that actualy counters the original for instance)

Quote

well people like that do act like animals yes, I'd say take away the children from then and give them a different way of life, away from violence and abuse etc

Genetically this poses a problem. Assuming I am right, and such things have heavy genetic factors, their already present children will end up with the genes aswell...does one fix them too? I see it as kinda cruel, but there are some benifits, such as more adequately purging the gene pool, and an even larger deterrent to those who would murder or rape. But punishing those who have done nothing...is iffy.

At any rate, this assumes I am right. If I am right, your supposed idea will do nothing. Well...it may do *something* but there is no guarantee that it will actualy prevent such things.

Quote

...Brave New World much?

Nope.

Quote

Plenty of supposedly "bad" people have reformed and "seen the light", so to speak.. going on to become productive and helpful people.

And many many more have not. Why take the chance?

Quote

Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnecessary; that's essentially what it already is.

No, it is a eugenics debate. Good job.

Quote

And testosterone doesn't mean anything unless the impulses it inspires are acted on..

Um hello? Such a large amount of testosterone will increase the chances that these impulses will be acted on, as they are stronger.

Quote

these male and female hormonal stereotypes have always annoyed me.

I am sorry, but facts are facts. Testosterone does do this. We know it, and pretending that it is a "stereotype" is just some strange way of hiding.

Quote

Unless an individual is truly insane or sufficiently retarded, they are technically free to act on any thought or impulse and are responsible for their actions, whatever their family history

Huh? What are you trying to say here?

Logged
SleepWalker
Pool Boy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588

Karma: 2

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #9 on: November 07, 2005, 08:21:42 PM »

Oh this sounds a whole lot like a surgery where they take something out and pretend like it made a difference, yet the patient still dies.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[/URL

Zankuro

Trasholin Can Fu Master

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 394

Karma: 0

"DD APPROVED! A-OKAYH"

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #10 on: November 07, 2005, 08:34:46 PM »

Actually, the issue is quite reminiscent of BNW. I'll go ahead and state that ostentatiously instead of using a mildly sarcastic rhetorical question. The literal denotation of eugenics is "The study of hereditary improvement of the human race by controlled selective breeding.", which is essentially the premise of the whole book.

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

And as to the not-entirely-polite "No, it is a eugenics debate. Good job." in response to my "Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnecessary; that's essentially what it already is.", I fail to see the difference if the issue is elimination/change of certain characteristics/people due to genetic profiling, when the opposing side is arguing that genes are not so important in behavior as environment.

Logged

If your heart is large enough to envelop your adversaries, you can see right through them and avoid their attacks. And once you envelop them, you will be able to guide them along the path indicated to you by heaven and earth.

~Morihei Ueshiba

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #11 on: November 07, 2005, 08:35:56 PM »

I was starting to think the same bit, Zank.

Go look up "eugenics" in a dictionary, sleepwalker -_- . Has anyone ever died from such an operation? (Modern era- no talking about ancient chinese eunuchs or whatever).

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM

Quote

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

Maybe to you. I find it very mercifull.

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM

Quote

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited.

Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Or...we can purge the genepool of such unwanted things in the first place, rather than aborting children. And this is in fact, outright eugenics, just like what I advocate. My way is better, as it does not do anything until somebody has actually done something, rather than just assuming that just because they have one gene, they will be evil. (one may have another gene that actually counters the original for instance)

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an actual criminal.

« Last Edit: November 07, 2005, 08:42:50 PM by Zake » Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #12 on: November 07, 2005, 08:43:17 PM »

Criminals can be very productive people when put in a labor prison. I'd say the people who should be eliminated are those with hereditary diseases and disabilities.

As for criminality being genetic, I'd say criminals who do it for thrill and passion either have it genetically or have it from a disorder, and criminals who do it out of desperation, fear, or need do it because of the situation they are in and it is not genetic.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #13 on: November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM »

Quote

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Actually, I would prefer outright slavery to the state. Being in jail just means you get free room and board for a long long time. You should work for that, thus, if you commit a horrible crime, you void your rights. You will work for what the state wishes you to work for, and all your property will be taken and given away...most likely to your victims. Or it may simply be retaken.

At any rate, sure, Jail is used. But jail...pfft. That is dumb, like I said. We need people to fear doing crime. Now, no amount of fear will get rid of it, but it will help.

Quote

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an actual criminal.

Um, it is outright eugenics. It is not allowing those with genes deemed unfavorable to reproduce, your method simply accomplishes this by not allowing them to be born at all.

Quote

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

I never said they were. In fact, this is why I say we should not punish anybody until they actually do something. To factor in other factors.

Quote

I fail to see the difference if the issue is elimination/change of certain characteristics/people due to genetic profiling, when the opposing side is arguing that genes are not so important in behavior as environment.

It is quite sad that there are still people out there that believe that tabula rosa crap. I am sorry, but most things really are genetic. Sure, environment plays a role, but genetics are what ultimately determine everything we do. Get over it.

Example:

I have the "murder gene" but am treated wonderfully. Though some miracle, I do not kill. Wonderful. Now, I have children who inherit it, and they are not treated so well. Thus they kill. They are castrated. Great. This assumes you are right, and environment plays almost all the role.

Now, it is silly to think that genetics plays no factor at all. So, assuming even that the environment is the major factor, it is still beneficial to get rid of the gene.

Quote

Criminals can be very productive people when put in a labor prison. I'd say the people who should be eliminated are those with hereditary diseases and disabilities.

Me too. And I advocate "slave the state" as well.

Quote

As for criminality being genetic, I'd say criminals who do it for thrill and passion either have it genetically or have it from a disorder, and criminals who do it out of desperation, fear, or need do it because of the situation they are in and it is not genetic.

Why bother trying to differentiate? I say cut them all!

Now in all seriousness, either way, it is best to fix them. If they do it out of fear, desperation, and because the situation "demanded" it, it is still most likely a genetic problem, causes them to be unable to think enough to get out of the situation through legal means. Snip snip.

Logged
Zake
Veritas Staff
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #14 on: November 07, 2005, 09:07:12 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Actually, I would prefer outright slavery to the state. Being in jail just means you get free room and board for a long long time. You should work for that, thus, if you commit a horrible crime, you void your rights. You will work for what the state wishes you to work for, and all your property will be taken and given away...most likely to your victims. Or it may simply be retaken.

At any rate, sure, Jail is used. But jail...pfft. That is dumb, like I said. We need people to fear doing crime. Now, no amount of fear will get rid of it, but it will help.

...Heh, by this view, why not use the death penalty? After all, places that use it have far lower crime rates because the fear of being punished is the foremost thing on anyones mind as they commit a crime.

The above paragraph is entirely sarcastic- last I heard, the death penalty (and, by logical extension, other fearsome punishments) have crime rates around the same as states that use regular ol' life in prison.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an an actual criminal.

Um, it is outright eugenics. It is not allowing those with genes deemed unfavorable to reproduce, your method simply accomplishes this by not allowing them to be born at all.

You misunderstand the process I'm talking about. It goes like this; when a criminal and

his wife really love each other, and the birds and the bees and so forth, the pregnant criminal or wife-of-criminal goes/is taken over to a clinic. There, genetic tests are run on the fetus, which look for the gene responsible for the (in this case) criminal disorder. If the gene is present, the fetus is aborted; if not, its allowed to be born. Keep in mind, that a criminal disorder in a parent would not necessarily be passed down; this is simple Mendelian genetics.

Simple case in point; genetic criminals would be able to have children, therefore its not eugenics, basically by definition.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

I never said they were. In fact, this is why I say we should not punish anybody untill they actually do something. To factor in other factors.

The point is, though, that their potential children haven't done anything. Why deny them existence when they may very well not follow their "genetic destiny"?

Perhaps this is another instance where another, nicer system can be used than eugenics. Why not just focus on giving genetically "criminal" children a benign environment that allows them to develop into law-abiding people? If you accept the huge role that nurture plays in the development of "criminal nature," it has to be admitted that this would be a largely effective procedure (except for the true disorders, perhaps... thus the other process, discussed above.)

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.15.html>

1 capture

07 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture
The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 11:42:00 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

166541 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 6543 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #15 on: November 07, 2005, 10:51:06 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 06:33:30 PM

So, yesterday, among other things, Kobok and I touched upon the subject of Eugenics, its ethics and practicality.

Since my name has been invoked, let me just clarify that I think eugenics is a moronic

idea. It's an idea based on several logical fallacies, and requires one to believe, firstly, that legality is a judge of character quality, and secondly, that behavior is a judge of genetic quality. Both of these are false, and at best, there are small correlations with major and frequent exceptions to the correlation.

For a few examples, lets consider some criminals. Mahatma Gandhi was a criminal. Martin Luther King Jr. was a criminal. Socrates was a criminal. Jesus was a criminal. Nelson Mandela was a criminal. Your proposal says that these people are not genetically fit. And I know, you'll try to compensate by choosing some smaller set of crimes to exclude these people, but in so doing you would only be reformulating the same intrinsic problem, which is that criminal conviction cannot accurately assess genetic value.

Logged
LightLink
Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #16 on: November 08, 2005, 05:06:44 AM »

Quote

For a few examples, lets consider some criminals. Mahatma Gandhi was a criminal. Martin Luther King Jr. was a criminal. Socrates was a criminal. Jesus was a criminal. Nelson Mandela was a criminal. Your proposal says that these people are not genetically fit. And I know, you'll try to compensate by choosing some smaller set of crimes to exclude these people, but in so doing you would only be reformulating the same intrinsic problem, which is that criminal conviction cannot accurately assess genetic value.

Yes, you brought these people up before. I said that their crimes were meaningless, since if people do not notice, I specifcy to only murder and rape. And have not mentioned it yet, but abuse and major theft. "Civil dissobedience" although stupid and annoying, is not a horrible horrible thing.

Quote

...Heh, by this view, why not use the death penalty? After all, places that use it have far lower crime rates because the fear of being punished is the foremost thing on anyones mind as they commit a crime.

The above paragraph is entirely sarcastic- last I heard, the death penalty (and, by logical extension, other fearsome punishments) have crime rates around the same as states that use regular ol' life in prison.

Actually, no. The death penalty does in fact act as a deterrent, however it is not very large. Most likely because death...well, that is not the worst that can happen.

Quote

You misunderstand the process I'm talking about. It goes like this; when a criminal and his wife really love each other, and the birds and the bees and so forth, the pregnant criminal or wife-of-criminal goes/is taken over to a clinic. There, genetic tests are run on the fetus, which look for the gene responsible for the (in this case) criminal disorder. If the gene is present, the fetus is aborted; if not, its allowed to be born. Keep in mind, that a criminal disorder in a parent would not necessarily be passed down; this is simple Mendelian genetics.

I understand you perfectly. I knew this is what you ment, and what I say still applies. It is outright eugenics by not allowing the babies with faulty genes to even be born, and thus getting rid of the unwanted gene over time.

Quote

Simple case in point; genetic criminals would be able to have children, therefore its not eugenics, basically by definition.

Yes, it is eugenics, as the criminals gene will not be able to pass on through tampering. The unwanted gene is gotten rid of.

Quote

The point is, though, that their potential children haven't done anything. Why deny them existence when they may very well not follow their "genetic destiny"?

What are you talking about? I do not advocate such things, I already said twice.

Quote

Perhaps this is another instance where another, nicer system can be used than eugenics. Why not just focus on giving genetically "criminal" children a benign environment that allows them to develop into law-abiding people? If you accept the huge role that nurture plays in the development of "criminal nature," it has to be admitted that this would be a largely effective procedure (except for the true disorders, perhaps... thus the other process, discussed above.)

Because attempting to nurter those who might become criminals is wastefull, and treats them unjustly for them having done nothing. It is better to simply wait and see if they do anything at all, before attempting to fix the problem.

Logged
Faijer

In Veritas, Faijer Moderates You
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2909

Existential Pragmatist

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #17 on: November 08, 2005, 05:48:03 AM »

Nature vs. nurture did I hear?

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/4293520.stm> - Google "white vs grey matter and lying" for more links

It seems that physiological components of the brain, white and grey matter, can actually affect our morality and ability to therefore commit acts of "crime" (though as kobok pointed out, what is crime? Merely the deviation and destruction of established social rules and laws?). However I would not say the amount is fixed, and would probably change the most during early childhood and teens, but that said, if the cause is physical like this research suggests, then it would certainly be manipulatable by medicine.

Logged

[Click here for my blog: All Faijer, all the time.](#)

The Game
SleepWalker
Pool Boy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #18 on: November 08, 2005, 06:13:58 AM »

Ofcourse behaviour can be manipulated by medicine all sorts of drugs, say sodium barbiturate a whole bunch of hypnotherapy.

Eugenics is a far worse Idea, here we have criminals, most likely self hating seeking

significance through destruction.

Eugenics then gives them further reason to feel insignificant, what is there reaction?

Apart from every single claim you make LL being completely off, it simply will not fly.

Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat.

This is destruction of a massive scale on possible descendants, forced interference such as this does not sit well

There is no freaking criminal gene there is no bright blinking highlighted gene that specifically instills criminal tendencies solely.

Survival instincts fearful delusion the situation and drastic action cannot be attributed to genetics of a single person in their lone lifetime.

Yourself in the same condition under the same circumstances would do as they did.

This is not about justice, this holds no virtue it's fearful vindictiveness.

Perhaps if this were to be offered as a plea bargain to sexual offenders, the decision is in their own hands.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[/URL

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1499

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #19 on: November 08, 2005, 08:55:09 AM »

Quote from: SleepWalker on November 08, 2005, 06:13:58 AM

Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat.

Don't forget about the mafia, who run more of the country than you'd like to know.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #20 on: November 08, 2005, 10:26:42 AM »

HOW IN HELL could criminal behaviour be genetic? "Criminal behaviour" is a subjective term referring to people who break the man-made laws of any given society (is a person "a criminal in need of eugenic modification" if they break the laws of a human country they don't even reside in?!). HOW does such disobedience to man-made laws stem from nature's blueprints?

~kakkarot

Edit: Oh, I guess I should have read everyone else's responses before adding my rehashed version ^_^ But as for murder and rape being accounted as "wrong" even by Nature: if that is true then why do animals do them and go unpunished? The idea of "criminal" stems from societal values and judging; Nature places neither good karma nor bad karma on any actions, regardless of how praiseworthy or despicable we humans may deem them.

Murder and rape are in the genes? I call bullshit as that would make it completely impossible for some people to commit either, while making it completely impossible for some people to not commit them.

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 10:33:15 AM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #21 on: November 08, 2005, 10:51:19 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:06:44 AM

Yes, you brought these people up before. I said that their crimes were meaningless, since if people do not notice, I specify to only murder and rape. And have not mentioned it yet, but abuse and major theft. "Civil disobedience" although stupid and annoying, is not a horrible horrible thing.

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit? How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night? How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night because the guy was trying to find food to eat, but the guy who shot him had no idea why he broke into the house? How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon? How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

Logged
LightLink
Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #22 on: November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM »

Silly hypothetical questions.

Quote

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit?

The situation in which he killed people was not a bad one.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night?

Self defence is ethical, and not a crime.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night because the guy was trying to find food to eat, but the guy who shot him had no idea why he broke into the house?

Self defence once again. It matters not the situation in which drives one to crime. There are plenty of legal ways to get food. Attempting an illegal route merely means you are incapable of thinking enough to go through a legal one. At any rate, the killing is justified, and it matters not why the other guy did it, merely that he did it.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon?

Self defence. Oops then. What kind of idiot goes around running up to some guy in a crazed manner holding a conspicuous object?

Quote

How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Justice has been done by the castration of the criminal. The killing is not justified, and he is therefore a criminal and killer, and needs to be fixed.

Quote

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

And I say, while this is true to a point, it matters not. Genes contribute, and it is best to play it safe and eliminate them where they are found.

Quote

HOW IN HELL could criminal behaviour be genetic? "Criminal behaviour" is a subjective term referring to people who break the man-made laws of any given society (is a person "a criminal in need of eugenic modification" if they break the laws of a human country they don't even reside in?!).

Please do not try to sound all philosophical, trying to point out the subjectivity of laws. They do not exist, the law is the law. Law is not subjective, ethics are, and while ethics are what laws are based on, it matters not. Laws are laws, so please do not try to act

smart.

Quote

HOW does such disobedience to man-made laws stem from nature's blueprints?

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. Murder is a universal crime. Theft is a universal crime. Rape is aswell. There are of course, justifiable reasons for these 3, and that is mostly universal aswell (war) and as such it matters not at that time. The point is, is that every crime I bring up are pretty much, universal. That would be because they are inherently bad to society, so every society has outlawed them.

Quote

Edit: Oh, I guess I should have read everyone else's responses before adding my rehashed version ^_^ But as for murder and rape being accounted as "wrong" even by Nature: if that is true then why do animals do them and go unpunished?

God, please go away. Nobody said murder and rape was wrong by Nature...as if nature was some sort of model for ethics or something. Sheesh, I said rape and murder were inherently detrimental to human society. Big difference.

Quote

The idea of "criminal" stems from societal values and judging; Nature places neither good karma nor bad karma on any actions, regardless of how praiseworthy or despicable we humans may deem them.

Nobody cares about the subjectivity of ethics. Stay on topic. Nobody cares about nature either. Stay on topic. Karma matters not aswell. Stay on topic!

By your crazy logic, nothing is unethical. I can do whatever, and nothing is illegal. Great logic buddy.

Quote

Murder and rape are in the genes? I call bullshit as that would make it completely impossible for some people to commit either, while making it completely impossible for some people to not commit them.

Please please please read what I say before you type. You sound so stupid when you get things so horribly wrong. I said genes are a factor. A factor! That means it is not the only reason, merely one in a large number of reasons.

Quote

Ofcourse behaviour can be manipulated by medicine all sorts of drugs, say sodium barbiturate a whole bunch of hypnotherapy.

Sure can.

Quote

Eugenics is a far worse Idea, here we have criminals, most likely self hating seeking significance through destruction. Eugenics then gives them further reason to feel insignificant, what is there reaction?

Nobody cares. They are inferior for committing such crimes. It matters not what they think or feel. They give up their rights by doing such things.

Quote

Apart from every single claim you make LL being completely off, it simply will not fly.

Nice job providing logic saying why. How is everything I say wrong?

Quote

Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat.

Abortion, homosexuals, drugs, evolution, and the idea of an old earth do not sit well with religious groups. Does that mean anything? No.

Quote

This is destruction of a massive scale on possible descendants, forced interference such as this does not sit well

Haha. So is war. Do we care? No. And how do you know it would not sit well. I do not see any polls regarding the general populace of such ideas.

Quote

There is no freaking criminal gene there is no bright blinking highlighted gene that specifically instills criminal tendencies solely.

1 - how do you know genetics does not play a factor. (which you imply)

2 - Nobody said it was bright and blinking, and instills criminal behavior solely. Merely that ones with certain genes may be more likely to commit crimes, and that is plenty of justification to eradicate them.

Quote

Survival instincts fearful delusion the situation and drastic action cannot be attributed to genetics of a single person in their lone lifetime.

This sentence does not make sense. Fix it.

Quote

Yourself in the same condition under the same circumstances would do as they did.

You do not know this. Do not speak as if you know what I would not or would do. Especially when you do not even give a situation.

Quote

This is not about justice, this holds no virtue it's fearful vindictiveness.

Is English your first language? I cannot understand much of what you say.

And this is not about justice (the only half of that sentence I got) it is about the right for society to protect itself. To purge bad genes from the gene pool. Justice just happens to come with it in my case.

Quote

Perhaps if this were to be offered as a plea bargain to sexual offenders, the decision is in their own hands.

Pfft. Please. They get no choice in anything if they are broken enough to do such things.

On a final note, yes I am being rude to a few people. I acknowledge this, but when they are shown to be inconsiderate enough to not actually read what I say, and then go off and whine about what I did not say, saying I am wrong for saying something I never said, I get irked. Therefore, my rudeness is justified as they were rude to me for not reading what I said.

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 03:35:28 PM by LightLink » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #23 on: November 08, 2005, 04:13:45 PM »

Perhaps it would be easier for us to correctly understand your arguments, LL, if you didn't put them in the form of single sentences in response to other people's single sentences; it is an entirely valid, indeed, more effective, method of debate to respond to the overall point of, say, a paragraph, rather than refuting every individual clause by itself.

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes"; murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

My understanding of kobok's basic point is that, even for a crime so fundamental as killing someone, the accountability, the wrongness of the crime, is always subjective. Kobok says that George Washington was a killer, and you argue that his case was a justifiable one- but what if he were being tried by Revolutionary-war era Britain? They would have a different view. Indeed, had they the scientific knowledge, they would perhaps have considered the genes that influenced him to be a "rebel" (to, of course, the extent he was influenced by his genes in this regard) to be "criminal." Whereas Good Ol' American Values considers a drive to overturn distasteful and harmful aspects of society to be a good thing.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #24 on: November 08, 2005, 04:16:02 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit?

The situation in which he killed people was not a bad one.

According to whose judgment? The method of deciding is critical, because for an approach as drastic as you're proposing, it must be rigorously foolproof.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon?

Self defence. Oops then. What kind of idiot goes around running up to some guy in a crazed manner holding a conspicuouse object?

This event DID happen recently. It turns out, it was a foreign exchange student who was invited to a party, and ran up to the house carrying his camera and saying, "Is this where the party is?" He was shot and killed by a trigger-happy and slightly paranoid man. If you'll note, you only concluded that he was an idiot because of the way I presented the scenario the first time, and therein lies one of the major problems. Presentation of the situation can change the answer.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Justice has been done by the castration of the criminal. The killing is not justified, and he is therefore a criminal and killer, and needs to be fixed.

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister?
Because this man is you.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

And I say, while this is true to a point, it matters not. Genes contribute, and it is best to play it safe and eliminate them where they are found.

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. ...

...

God, please go away ...

...

You sound so stupid ...

...

On a final note, yes I am being rude to a few people. I acknowledge this, but when they are shown to be inconsiderate enough to not actually read what I say, and then go off and whine about what I did not say, saying I am wrong for saying something I never said, I get irked. Therefore, my rudeness is justified as they were rude to me for not reading what I said.

You may feel your rudeness is "justified", but it is not permitted, and in blatant violation of the rules. You WILL be respectful here, in this discussion and elsewhere, or you will be removed.

Logged
LightLink
Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #25 on: November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM »

Quote

According to whose judgment? The method of deciding is critical, because for an approach as drastic as you're proposing, it must be rigorously foolproof.

War is war. A hot war requires killing. It is not unethical to kill during war.

Quote

This event DID happen recently. It turns out, it was a foreign exchange student who was invited to a party, and ran up to the house carrying his camera and saying, "Is this where the party is?" He was shot and killed by a trigger-happy and slightly paranoid man. If you'll note, you only concluded that he was an idiot because of the way I presented the scenario the first time, and therein lies one of the major problems. Presentation of the situation can change the answer.

Surely it can...if only everything was recorded we could make more accurate judgments...

Quote

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister?
Because this man is you.

I do not understand.

Quote

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Because it is very likely that this "something" as you call it, is a problem. It is not proven without a doubt yet, but still very likely. Why risk the chance. When one can actually help get rid of a cause of such behavior.

Quote

You may feel your rudeness is "justified", but it is not permitted, and in blatant violation of the rules. You WILL be respectful here, in this discussion and elsewhere, or you will be removed.

Then why do people not read what I say? People need to be respectful to me and read what I say, rather than jump to baseless conclusions. It is a slap in the face to have people do such crazy things.

Quote

Perhaps it would be easier for us to correctly understand your arguments, LL, if you didn't put them in the form of single sentences in response to other people's single sentences; it is an entirely valid, indeed, more effective, method of debate to respond to the overall point of, say, a paragraph, rather than refuting every individual clause by itself.

I do not believe so. You see, if I were to take it as a paragraph, a paragraph that has more than one point mind you, then it becomes confusing as to which point I am in fact referring to. Confusion is eliminated by taking it an idea at a time.

Quote

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes"; murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

Yes, this is true. And I have addressed such cases already. Self defence and war have been brought up. Others have been as well. Read please.

Quote

My understanding of Kobok's basic point is that, even for a crime so fundamental as killing someone, the accountability, the wrongness of the crime, is always subjective. Kobok says that George Washington was a killer, and you argue that his case was a

justifiable one- but what if he were being tried by Revolutionary-war era Britain?

War is war. I would not go off and say that just because our enemy is killing us, they are murderers. We are at war! It is justifiable to kill at war. This is also why "apologizing for war-time atrocities" is an idiotic idea. War is war, war is not nice, and there is no reason to apologize for it. There is no reason to punish those who killed at war. It is justifiable regardless. Only if you go insane and kill your own side or something, should you be punished.

Quote

They would have a different view. Indeed, had they the scientific knowledge, they would perhaps have considered the genes that influenced him to be a "rebel" (to, of course, the extent he was influenced by his genes in this regard) to be "criminal." Whereas Good Ol' American Values considers a drive to overturn distasteful and harmful aspects of society to be a good thing.

I see. Then perhaps it would benefit society to have infact, sterilized all the crazy rebels. We would not have such problems if everybody complied with the will of the monarch.

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #26 on: November 08, 2005, 05:13:07 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Surely it can...if only everything was recorded we could make more accurate judgments...

No, then you just get a third perspective, that of the camera. In the above example I gave there were two people who were there, experiencing the actual tangible event, and yet they perceived different things based on their vantage-point. The camera is just a third such vantage-point.

The "Howard Dean scream" was recorded, and the recording itself was actually less

accurate than the observations of people present.

The Kennedy assassination was recorded, and so now everyone draws the same conclusion, has accurate judgment, and agrees with the same objective truth? Orrr.... not.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister? Because this man is you.

I do not understand.

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Because it is very likely that this "something" as you call it, is a problem. It is not proven without a doubt yet, but still very likely. Why risk the chance. When one can actually help get rid of a cause of such behavior.

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Then why do people not read what I say? People need to be respectful to me and read what I say, rather than jump to baseless conclusions. It is a slap in the face to have people do such crazy things.

People can read fine, they just don't agree with you. You having discussed a topic is not the same as you having adequately refuted a point. If you want to refute something, it takes more than just telling people what you feel.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

War is war. I would not go off and say that just because our enemy is killing us, they are murderers. We are at war! It is justifiable to kill at war. This is also why "apologizing for war-time atrocities" is an idiotic idea. War is war, war is not nice, and there is no reason to apologize for it. There is no reason to punish those who killed at war. It is

justifiable regardless. Only if you go insane and kill your own side or something, should you be punished.

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

Logged
LightLink
Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics
« Reply #27 on: November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM »

Quote

No, then you just get a third perspective, that of the camera. In the above example I gave there were two people who were there, experiencing the actual tangible event, and yet they perceived different things based on their vantage-point. The camera is just a third such vantage-point.

The "Howard Dean scream" was recorded, and the recording itself was actually less accurate than the observations of people present.

The Kennedy assassination was recorded, and so now everyone draws the same conclusion, has accurate judgment, and agrees with the same objective truth? Orrr.... not.

Glad that this is not what I mean. You know what I meant, we spoke of it already.

Quote

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

One should not take the law into their own hands. The government will do it, there is no need for you to do it yourself.

Quote

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

You sure of that? I hear from most people that who we are is actually fairly split, 50/50, between genetics and upbringing. I have never heard anything in favor of upbringing completely.

Quote

People can read fine, they just don't agree with you. You having discussed a topic is not the same as you having adequately refuted a point. If you want to refute something, it takes more than just telling people what you feel.

There is a difference between disagreeing, and getting what I actually said completely wrong. Or repeating an argument I have already addressed.

Quote

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

For example, this. I already spoke of this. This is one of the only ethical reasons for governmental punishment during war, when you attack your own side, which is what this hypothetical person is doing.

Was is war. It is different to do something in time of peace, than to do it in time of war.

Logged
Zake
Veritas Staff
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #28 on: November 08, 2005, 05:36:46 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes"; murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

Yes, this is true. And I have addressed such cases already. Self defence and war have been brought up. Others have been aswell. Read please.

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #29 on: November 08, 2005, 05:39:36 PM »

Quote

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

Oh. So then, you had no point? As this is irrelevant.

Quote

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

I disagree. I have stated why already, several times.

Logged

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.30.html>

2 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 23 Jun 2013

May JUN Jul

23

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 02:37:08 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209062 Posts in 14845 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk Most
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ Eugenics 0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic. « previous

next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 11073 times)

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #30 on: November 08, 2005, 05:48:42 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:39:36 PM

Quote

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

Oh. So then, you had no point? As this is irrelevant.

Quote

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

I disagree. I have stated why already, several times.

If that is the case, I cannot find your arguments against this point, or consider them to be insufficient. Please re-state them- re-iteration is 90% of any debate cool.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #31 on: November 08, 2005, 07:06:50 PM »

The law is an adequate gauge of genetic fitness, as it is illegal in every society to rape, steal, and murder, and this is because these things are detrimental to society. Thus, if you do them, you are inferior, and we must get rid of any and all genes that would contribute to it.

Logged
kakkarot
0. The Fool... Inverted?
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701
Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #32 on: November 08, 2005, 07:08:23 PM »

Quote

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. Murder is a universal crime. Theft is a universal crime. Rape is aswell. There are of course, justifiable reasons for these 3, and that is mostly universal aswell (war) and as such it matters not at that time. The point is, is that every crime I bring up are pretty much, universal. That would be because they are inherently bad to society, so every society has outlawed them.

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of

criminals/percieved-criminals. Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire argument is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 07:10:22 PM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #33 on: November 08, 2005, 07:44:02 PM »

Quote

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

No, it does not, but it sure does make me feel better, getting rid of all that pent up hatred for people not reading.

Quote

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of criminals/percieved-criminals.

Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder.

Quote

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there. Aswell, I adressed this with the castration of the children of the murderer, as this would help ensure that you eradicate the genes, but it is unethical. If you are so willing to make sure, then that is what you would simply have to do.

And finally, if you castrate people who do things you do not like, you will help get rid of genes that cause that which you do not like. Let us say you do not like scientifically "stupid" people. Through many generations, certainly you would have a decrease in the amount of those who are scientifically "stupid" and an increase in those that are. You may end up having something bad happen too, like a decrease in artistically talented people or what have you, but you do not care because you helped get rid of a trait you do not like.

Quote

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire arguement is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

Cannot prove a negative.

No, my ideology says that you should be castrated for doing the murder, and in doing so, you help clean the gene pool. You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this. It is unethical to punish those who have done nothing. Not only this, but I have already spoken of this! There can be other genes that can counteract such things, and thus if we were to get rid of the person, we would get rid of the good genes along with the bad. Not only that, but there are undoubtedly more than one gene that would cause such behaviour, and just because you have one does not do anything. It is safer to wait for it to manifest than it is to be stupid and go "snip, you have a penis!"

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #34 on: November 08, 2005, 09:08:22 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

One should not take the law into their own hands. The government will do it, there is no need for you to do it yourself.

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

You sure of that? I hear from most people that who we are is actually fairly split, 50/50, between genetics and upbringing. I have never heard anything in favor of upbringing completely.

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in

assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

For example, this. I already spoke of this. This is one of the only ethical reasons for governmental punishment during war, when you attack your own side, which is what this hypothetical person is doing.

Was is war. It is different to do something in time of peace, than to do it in time of war.

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

(And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?)

Quote from: LightLink

You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588

Karma: 1

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #35 on: November 08, 2005, 11:26:21 PM »

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

hail LL.

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I would recommend you take a nice long hard look at yourself LL.

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[/URL

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #36 on: November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM »

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception.

Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder. Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Dont question, until after you understood the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditated killing of a human being by another...
Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?
According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #37 on: November 09, 2005, 10:21:20 AM »

Quote from: solstice on November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder. Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Dont question, until after you understood the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditated killing of a human being by another...

Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?

According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:24:29 AM by kobok » Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #38 on: November 09, 2005, 10:28:12 AM »

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference between murder and not-murder? Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make *everything* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/42644.html#section-229> Good thing America doesn't own the world Cheesy

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You

cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have. In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely *know* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone. Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:36:00 AM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #39 on: November 09, 2005, 11:07:17 AM »

Quote

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets

people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 11:16:57 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #40 on: November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM »

Quote

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

And you are right. I never said it was really immoral for the person to take revenge, it is just, that is what the law is for. We have the death penalty, yet if you killed somebody who killed a family member, you go to jail because what you did was against the law, even if it is ethical.

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

Quote

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Aggression is not the only thing that causes crime. Stupidity is a big one, whether due to bad upbringing or...they are just stupid. As well as a few other things. Aggressive people can still lead productive criminal free lives.

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

Quote

And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?

It does not. It is simply okay during war.

Quote

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

There is a difference between acting idiotic, and being an idiot, having idiotic responses, and being an idiot.

Why do you not make good arguments here, as you did in chat? Sure, some of this is fine, but hypothetical situations being proposed left and right does nothing.

Quote

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

Lol. It is sad, that this is true(minus the hitler part). Although I do try to not insult people but sometimes it is such a slap in the face for people to not read, or to have crazy ideas.

Quote

hail LL.

W00t.

Quote

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

The problem is, is there are some flaws, but that is just because not everything is perfect. These people are not pointing out the flaws, so much as bringing up hypothetical questions to determine the ethics of something. Why do they not go against the death penalty for such things? Atleast with this, you get to live! I do not propose "the perfect system" nearly a better one. And pointing out that everything is not always peachy and flowery with fluffy kittens is not doing anything productive.

Quote

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I think it is you who do not understand these concepts.

Quote

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Nice one.

Quote

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference between murder and not-murder?

Duh. Murder is illegal killing. Or did you not know that?

Quote

Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make *everything* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

This is what I mean. Of course everything we do not like is illegal, that is why it is illegal! We do not like murder, rape, stealing, cheating, abuse, molestation, ect. so we make them illegal! What do you think the purpose of laws are? And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Quote

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

No, murder is illegal. It does not matter if it is conscious or not. All murder is killing, not all killing is murder. Understand that.

Quote

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have.

Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one. And there are undoubtedly many many things that contribute to such crime. And we do not even know what they are either! So in fact, no, we can not prove this negative.

Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely *know* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Quote

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone.

I never said anything like this. I will stop replying to you if you keep this up. I said, people who do such crimes should be castrated. I actively went against what you just said twice now. We should do something, when they do something. We do not know for certain that just because they have it, they will do it.

So, not if they have the genes! Only if they do it! Understand?

Quote

Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

We have mapped the entire genome, but we have not a clue what they all do, and we are not about to do it all again. Sequencing every single strand takes time. Thus, we can not prove that they have it, nor that they do not, the point is, is that they committed a bad crime, should be punished, genes contributed to the crime even if in a small way, so we can kill two birds with one stone.

Quote

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

I spoke of this too. Twice now. I said it was unethical to really purge the genepool. The way we could *really* do it would be to say, castrate anybody who is directly related to the convict. Parents, siblings, children. That would make sure. It would get cleaned out that way. Is it ethical? They have done nothing, so no.

What I say, is that this helps. More so than doing nothing at all.

Quote

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

Did I not call you a Nazi in chat just yesterday, and you took offence? And here you are doing it to me. Good thing I do not care. What I do care about though is the double standard. Either change the rules, or obey them. Or do not obey them and just do not bother me.

Now, ontopic, this is wrong. Murder is a legal defnition, it has to be against the law to be considered "murder." If you wish to be generic, the word "killing" does exist.

But like Kobok said, it is the ethics of it, which I responded too. It is equally ethical regardless of who did it, but we have laws to keep people from taking things into their own hands.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 04:54:11 PM by LightLink » Logged
kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #41 on: November 09, 2005, 03:56:10 PM »

HOLY FUCK, how do you do this without realizing it?

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And *then* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

You don't understand anything you're saying, do you?

"Of course everything we do not like is illegal, that is why it is illegal!" Not quite. Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol). Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them. There's a huge difference. And even if you go the route of "legal killing" versus "illegal killing" there's NO FUCKING WAY that your genes can tell the difference between killing that's legal and killing that's illegal. So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #42 on: November 09, 2005, 05:02:31 PM »

Quote

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And *then* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

After this, I refuse to talk to you any longer.

We did it. It took us what, 10 years? What did I say? "It would take years to...." That is for one person. We would have to do it all over again to somebody to see if they personally have something. And that is assuming we know what every single little code does, which we do not.

Quote

Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol).

We as a people do not like people hurting themselves, so it is illegal. But if that changes, it might be legal. As in, if they suddenly like it. You just proved me.

Quote

Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them.

There's a huge difference.

That would be because even if the majority of people did not like children, they would aslo not like dying as a species.

Quote

So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

Not certainly. But let us assume they do have similar enough genes that they meet what you are saying.

1 - The reason the killer did it is much much different then the cop. The cop did it out of self defence. (a cop cannot kill the killer any other way and it be legal)

2 - The killer was most defignitely not feeling fearfull for his life when the killing took place. (Assuming an actual malicious murder anyway)

Quote

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

Thank you.

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #43 on: November 09, 2005, 05:53:29 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

"The reason is that crime is crime! You are trying to commit crime! You are trying to get stuff and feel better!

Crime happens. When you are committing crime, you wish to get stuff and hurt people, and a part of crime is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When committing crime, this stuff happens, and because you are committing crime, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality."

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely *know* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not

have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM
What I say, is that this helps. Moreso than doing nothing at all.

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment. Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #44 on: November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM »

Quote

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

You make castration out to be such a horrible thing in response for rape and murder. But oh, it seems lifetime imprisonment, where you can not do must of anything you wish, and killing, is perfectly justified. How so?

I see no problem with castration. It is no more detrimental than society imprisoning and killing people.

Quote

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

I am only trying to justify not punishing people for war. War is fairly unethical, just like crime. But it is insane to suggest punishing your soldiers! Or to just...not protect yourself or something. War happens. Crime happens. Both are unethical, but you cannot punish people for war, if they are your own people.

Quote

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

I do not agree at all. I think lifetime incarceration is fairly unethical. I cannot do a damn thing I want. I have to get raped by greasy people in showers. I have to be told when to eat, sleep, and use the restroom. I have no freedom at all. And it is for the rest of my life. It is worse than death.

The citizens pay for constant room and board for criminals. They get free shelter and food for the rest of their life. That is expensive.

How is it more foolproof? You get tried before a punishment is carried out! In both situations, you get tried, get convicted, and then something different happens. Permanent incarceration and castration offer no difference in freedom against false-convictions.

Quote

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

It is probably close to zero. It does not make sense for people to commit murder to have parents that do it as well.

Quote

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

No, I would not be surprised it makes sense. Given that some people cannot think

enough to figure out how to get out of such a situation, and are so pathetic that they get all sad and angry from having one parent.

In comparison, would it not be an interesting hypothesis to say that the difference between the people who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and commit murder, and the ones who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and do not commit murder is a genetic one? Of course, counting in other environmental factors. But even then, the ones who have everything in common with a killer, but did not kill, most likely have a genetic difference.

Quote

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment. Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

And what in the world does incarcerating people against their will, or killing them against their will, or taking their money, or putting them in an asylum, do? Does it give a significant contribution? No, we do not even try to rehabilitate most criminals. And if you are sick in the head, you are sick in the head. It is not common to be "fixed" from such things. Is it cruel and unusual? Just as much as castration. At least with castration, I can still live, and do what I want after I get out of "prison." (as lifetime incarceration is unethical)

And how does any of the things we do not prevent future offences? Atleast castration would get rid of tons of testosterone, which will change their their chemistry and make them more passive.

Logged

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.45.html>

1 capture

23 Jun 2013

May JUN Jul

23

2012 2013 2014

About this capture
The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 03:13:24 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209063 Posts in 14846 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk Most
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 11078 times)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #45 on: November 09, 2005, 07:20:20 PM »

The entire idea of genetics causing people to murder and rape is ridiculous in the first place. Genes define the physical characteristics of the body and do not control actions. Actions are a result of brain processes, not genetics. Genetics determine your eye colour, your hair colour, your height, your metabolism, etc. Your brain determines if you kill someone, or rape someone, or steal something. Way different set of parameters.

The idea of genetics causing people to perform actions is based upon a simplification of

the entire field of genetics.

Did I say I wouldn't reply? What? I'm evil. I lied.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Nereus

Kher Heb

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 363

Karma: 4

Step I

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #46 on: November 09, 2005, 09:14:43 PM »

I don't even have the volition to read through most of this, but.

Kak summed it up well enough--genetics serves its own function, the brain dictates action.

Why? I'll provide a few, simple examples.

I'm descended from more "mob" family than I care to count; yay for being Italian.

I think they'd fall into the "violent crime" category. Yet I've never even been into a fist-fight. Has the opportunity presented itself? Many times.

But I've always chosen not to risk my hide over something so stupid.

Genetic damage won't suddenly morph you into a rabid killing machine.

But severe trauma to the brain can cause serious and extreme changes in personality, ability to make choices, etc.

The problem with the world isn't criminals passing on their "seed". It's gross generalizations based off a complete lack of accurate information.

God bless propoganda.

Logged

Sometimes my shadow leads, or it follows me, but we never seem to become one and

the same.
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #47 on: November 10, 2005, 01:52:05 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

I am only trying to justify not punishing people for war. War is fairly unethical, just like crime. But it is insane to suggest punishing your soldiers! Or to just...not protect yourself or something. War happens. Crime happens. Both are unethical, but you cannot punish people for war, if they are your own people.

Yes we damn well can punish our own people for doing something wrong in the midst of war. We would be foolish not to. Do you know why the insurgents in Iraq were dressing up westerners in orange jumpsuits and torturing them? It was in direct retaliation for our torture of Iraqi citizens and other Arabs who we had dressed up in orange jumpsuits. When our own people violate the rules of war in an immoral and criminal way, then innocent people on both sides of the conflict are hurt. We not only CAN punish them, but we have a moral obligation to do so. It will be a long time before everything is said and done in response to those events.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

And how does any of the things we do not prevent future offences? Atleast castration would get rid of tons of testosterone, which will change their their chemistry and make them more passive.

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

I do not agree at all. I think lifetime incarceration is fairly unethical. I can not do a darn thing I want. I have to get raped by greasy people in showers. I have to be told when to eat, sleep, and use the restroom. I have no freedom at all. And it is for the rest of my life. It is worse than death.

The citizens pay for constant room and board for criminals. They get free shelter and food for the rest of their life. That is expensive.

How is it more foolproof? You get tried before a punishment is carried out! In both situations, you get tried, get convicted, and then something different happens. Permanent incarceration and castration offer no difference in freedom against false-convictions.

You should study the legal process more carefully. Innocent people are convicted and then have those convictions overturned on a regular basis. This is actually fairly common in rape and murder cases, since with emotions running so high, rational thought is at a minimum. There have even been a significant number of people put to death in the U.S. and then later found innocent. (Oops.) Permanent incarceration for the most serious offenses is the ONLY punishment which simultaneously serves as a punishment for the guilty, an isolation to protect the innocent, and yields all the time possible for the innocent to prepare a better defense and appeal their conviction.

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

It is probably close to zero. It does not make sense for people to commit murder to have parents that do it aswell.

Well then lets use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Logged
Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.
LightLink
Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics
« Reply #48 on: November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM »

Quote

Yes we damn well can punish our own people for doing something wrong in the midst of war. We would be foolish not to. Do you know why the insurgents in Iraq were dressing up westerners in orange jumpsuits and torturing them? It was in direct retaliation for our torture of Iraqi citizens and other Arabs who we had dressed up in orange jumpsuits. When our own people violate the rules of war in an immoral and criminal way, then innocent people on both sides of the conflict are hurt. We not only CAN punish them, but we have a moral obligation to do so. It will be a long time before everything is said and done in response to those events.

Fine. You are right.

Quote

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Quote

You should study the legal process more carefully. Innocent people are convicted and then have those convictions overturned on a regular basis. This is actually fairly common in rape and murder cases, since with emotions running so high, rational thought is at a minimum. There have even been a significant number of people put to death in the U.S. and then later found innocent. (Oops.) Permanent incarceration for the most serious offenses is the ONLY punishment which simultaneously serves as a punishment for the guilty, an isolation to protect the innocent, and yields all the time possible for the innocent to prepare a better defense and appeal their conviction.

Irrelivant. You say that many are put to death and then later found innocent. I knew this already, but you said it. If it happens now, nobody cares about it now (nobody with enough power, or not enough people with power), than what is the problem with castration and later found to be innocent? At least you get to live. And besides, I try to prevent that.

Quote

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

I would not be suprised. But does that mean that lifetime imprisonment is cheap? No. Simply it is cheaper than something else. A million dollar house is still cheaper than a billion dollar one, but the million dollar one is still expensive.

Quote

Well then lets use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Genetics is complicated. Not only are there other reasons that murderers do not have children who murder, but the child may not have inhereted the correct genes to be stupid enough to murder. Do we track the descendants of murderers, in order to make sure that none of them commit a horrible crime, ever?

Logged
solstice
Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #49 on: November 10, 2005, 05:41:59 AM »

Quote

Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in.

We already do that. In fact it is considered culturally acceptable and religiously important. We call it circumcision. It's not less barbaric, but there you have it.

Lightlink, there is a significant link between estrogen and cancer, that you failed to take into consideration. The risk of cancer increases with the loss of testosterone, which is why females are more likely to get cancer; and older men are more likely to, as well as heart disease.

Instead of assuming you are a physician, actually take out some books on the subject, or ask someone with a degree.

PS - how do you propose to deal with women to commit sexual assault?

« Last Edit: November 10, 2005, 06:00:31 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3201

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #50 on: November 10, 2005, 09:28:32 AM »

Quote from: LightLink

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Testicular cancer? Abnormally high levels of oestrogen compared to testosterone, either through testosterone loss or oestrogen increase, or both, can lead to testicular cancer.

Have you never watched Fight Club? (in Fight Club's case, Bob had much higher levels of testosterone and his body responded by upping the oestrogen, which had the same

end result).

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #51 on: November 10, 2005, 10:44:15 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Wikipedia is a bit barren at times. Try googling around. There have been studies linking low testosterone levels in men to prostate cancer, to Leukemia, and likely to an assortment of other cancers. Women have an assortment of comparable problems with estrogen levels and cancer.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Irrelevant. You say that many are put to death and then later found innocent. I knew this already, but you said it. If it happens now, nobody cares about it now (nobody with enough power, or not enough people with power), then what is the problem with castration and later found to be innocent? At least you get to live. And besides, I try to prevent that.

Yeah, I'm sure when you're innocent and somebody cuts off your nuts for it, the fact that somebody wanted to prevent wrongful convictions will be very comforting to you.

As for "nobody with power cares", you should read the news:

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/01/11/illinois.death.row/>

Perhaps not enough people with power care enough, sure, that's usually a problem. But people are certainly and genuinely concerned about this problem from both political parties.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

I would not be suprised. But does that mean that lifetime imprisonment is cheap? No. Simply it is cheaper than something else. A million dollar house is still cheaper than a billion dollar one, but the million dollar one is still expensive.

Castration is not a solution to REPLACE lifetime imprisonment. Imprisonment is used for much more than just a punishment, it also isolates the guilty from future victims. Castrating people and releasing them would be a terrible idea in comparison. So saying it "costs some money" is not a relevant argument. Yes, it costs some money to keep people in prison, and that expense is necessary to achieve maximal justice.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

Well then lets use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Genetics is complicated. Not only are there other reasons that murderers do not have children who murder, but the child may not have inhereted the correct genes to be stupid enough to murder. Do we track the descendants of murderers, in order to make sure that none of them commit a horrible crime, ever?

You tell me. You're the one who proposed that genetics is relevant here, despite the mass of people and evidence arguing against you. Then you yourself even admitted that there's almost no hereditary correlation between parent and child for murder.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #52 on: November 10, 2005, 04:20:13 PM »

Quote

PS - how do you propose to deal with women to commit sexual assault?

This is why I tried to keep using the term "fix."

Quote

Wikipedia is a bit barren at times. Try googling around. There have been studies linking low testosterone levels in men to prostate cancer, to Leukemia, and likely to an assortment of other cancers. Women have an assortment of comparable problems with estrogen levels and cancer.

I see. How low are we speaking? We *could* give them pills to prevent this. But that would ruin the pluss of sedating them.

Quote

Yeah, I'm sure when you're innocent and somebody cuts off your nuts for it, the fact that somebody wanted to prevent wrongful convictions will be very comforting to you.

As for "nobody with power cares", you should read the news:

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/01/11/illinois.death.row/>

Perhaps not enough people with power care enough, sure, that's usually a problem. But people are certainly and genuinely concerned about this problem from both political parties.

I said "or." It is either nobody with power, or not enough people with power. I said this. Also, if I am innocent and will be killed tomorrow, I sure as hell would be more angry than just losing the ability to reproduce. Besides, I have another thread going on proposing a solution to this "false conviction" problem.

Quote

Castration is not a solution to REPLACE lifetime imprisonment. Imprisonment is used for much more than just a punishment, it also isolates the guilty from future victims. Castrating people and releasing them would be a terrible idea in comparison. So saying it "costs some money" is not a relevant argument. Yes, it costs some money to

keep people in prison, and that expense is necessary to achieve maximal justice.

Never said it would replace it. But lifetime imprisonment is dumb. You should only stay for a few years, as a slave to the state, so you can work for your room and board. That way you are not a useless leech to society, and it makes up for the money spent on you. And finally, you get released, and you can do as you please later. Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life.

Quote

You tell me. You're the one who proposed that genetics is relevant here, despite the mass of people and evidence arguing against you. Then you yourself even admitted that there's almost no hereditary correlation between parent and child for murder.

I doubt it. I have no idea. I was actually asking. If we do not constantly keep track, it would be very difficult to prove either way. However, genetics has a hand in everything. Surely, if even a little, it has a hand in criminal acts, and that is justification enough.

And I think it has less to do with "genetics has nothing to do with it" and more to do with "they did not get the right combination of genes."

Logged
solstice
Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #53 on: November 10, 2005, 05:38:45 PM »

Lightlink, are you enjoying all this?

Quote

Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life. I think you need to get a little perspective on reality. Prisoners have lots of rights, which sometimes outweighs that of their victims - the law takes great measures to insure the safety of those prosecuted.. This is especially true in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault on a minor.

On a more fundamental note, try looking into the first thing you learn in US History and Government: The Constitution. Several amendemts promise rights of those accused and prosecuted, including the right to a FAIR trial and the right to be present during their prosecution.

Then, we have the MIRANDA RIGHTS which include the right to legal representation. During incarseration, an appointed lawer may continue to work for that person.

If I were you, I would also get to know some people who actually work in a prison, instead of making gueses at what you think happens. Prisoners get a lot of privilages that taxes pay for, which includes regular means and cable television.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

ShiningDragon

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #54 on: November 10, 2005, 06:35:29 PM »

Needless to say, but if everyone were kept in prison and we implemented all the things you have noted link it would raise taxes skyhigh. Everytime a prisoner goes to the bathroom we are paying the bill and I still don't believe that genetics have anything to do with a person's behavior. I know that certain characteristic's of genetics like that they way people cross their legs is genetic, and how they sleep, but I don't think this carries much further than that. Also alot of the ideas you suggested were on the lines of cruel and unusual I'd say like crastrating people. Definately don't agree with that one.

Logged

"The church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church." - Ferdinand Magellan

And you shall cry tears of crimson...

LightLink

Has a lot of posts
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #55 on: November 10, 2005, 07:49:37 PM »

Quote

I think you need to get a little perspective on reality. Prisoners have lots of rights, which sometimes outweighs that of their victims - the law takes great measures to insure the safety of those prosecuted.. This is especially true in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault on a minor.

On a more fundamental note, try looking into the first thing you learn in US History and Government: The Constitution. Several amendments promise rights of those accused and prosecuted, including the right to a FAIR trial and the right to be present during their prosecution.

Then, we have the MIRANDA RIGHTS which include the right to legal representation. During incarceration, an appointed lawyer may continue to work for that person.

If I were you, I would also get to know some people who actually work in a prison, instead of making guesses at what you think happens. Prisoners get a lot of privileges that taxes pay for, which includes regular meals and cable

I think we have our ideas of reality on different planes. I would much rather like not getting butt raped in the shower, than watch TV. I would like to do what I wish to do, to take a piss when I feel like it, go to sleep when I feel like it, you know, do what I want! You cannot do this in prison. Everything else you said has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

Quote

Insert Quote

Needless to say, but if everyone were kept in prison and we implemented all the things you have noted like it would raise taxes skyhigh. Everytime a prisoner goes to the bathroom we are paying the bill and I still don't believe that genetics have anything to do with a person's behavior. I know that certain characteristics of genetics like that they way people cross their legs is genetic, and how they sleep, but I don't think this carries much further than that. Also a lot of the ideas you suggested were on the lines of cruel and unusual I'd say like castrating people. Definitely don't agree with that one.

Really? How so. Added costs for castration is about it. And since lifetime incarceration is gone, aswell as the death penalty, I say taxes would be a bit lower. Aswell, since you would be a slave to the state for the time you are imprisoned, you give back to society by working. Building bridges and what not.

Because killing is not cruel and unusual. Please. Castration is no more cruel than killing.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #56 on: November 10, 2005, 07:52:40 PM »

Quote

Everything else you said has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

Now, you are just being plane silly. How do RIGHTS have nothing to do with prisoner RIGHTS? You brought it up, remember.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #57 on: November 10, 2005, 08:01:03 PM »

Because what you can do in prison has nothing to do with what happens before you get there. Not in a relevant way.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #58 on: November 10, 2005, 08:25:12 PM »

Quote

Because what you can do in prison has nothing to do with what happens before you get there. Not in a relevant way.

Wrong, again. Ever hear of minimum and maximum security prisons? And why would you say prisoners have "no rights" to saying that what they did has no bearing on those rights? The US legal system is set up so that not only do they get rights, but privileges and securities relative to what kind of sentence they are serving.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #59 on: November 11, 2005, 12:05:42 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:20:13 PM

Also, if I am innocent and will be killed tomorrow, I sure as hell would be more angry than just losing the ability to reproduce.

...

But lifetime imprisonment is dumb. You should only stay for a few years, as a slave to the state, so you can work for your room and board. That way you are not a useless leech to society, and it makes up for the money spent on you. And finally, you get released, and you can do as you please later. Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life.

First of all, no one in this thread is proposing killing prisoners, so this is a straw-man. We are comparing lifetime imprisonment and castration, and it is simply a straw-man to say that castration is better than killing, because these are not the two things being compared.

As for "lifetime imprisonment is dumb", I am baffled by your new proposal. You began this thread with a desire to reduce the number of crimes committed, and you proposed that a tiny reduction in crimes could be obtained by castrating those convicted of violent crimes. While this has been effectively refuted by the complete lack of statistical support for the hereditary nature of murder, what you are now proposing is taking murderers, making them build bridges for a few years, and then releasing them back into society?!?

If you want a good statistic, how about that 1.5% of all released murderers kill again (and that's just counting the ones who manage to get caught twice). If you generalize it to simply violent crime, repeat rates are much higher. Prison sentences are not just a punishment, they are for the purpose of isolating society from dangerous individuals, so that they cannot hurt more people. Releasing all the murderers after a few years is one of the worst and most dangerous proposals you've come up with yet, and would result in a lot of dead people.

If you think serving a lifetime prison sentence is too harsh of a punishment, then don't kill anyone. If you find yourself wrongfully convicted, then spend that time trying to figure out how to demonstrate your innocence. But don't just put murderers in the timeout chair, chop off their testicles, and then put them back on the streets. This would be utterly insane.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.120.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 23 Jun 2013

Jul JUN Jul

23

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 01:27:44 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209062 Posts in 14845 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk Most
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9] Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 11071 times)

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588

Karma: 1

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #120 on: November 21, 2005, 07:22:07 PM »

Quote from: dreamingcarnage on November 21, 2005, 04:50:14 PM

It was never really a debate and to Lightlink's opposition, telling him he needs sources and research and not giving any of your own is the same thing, you both are the different sides of the same coin. Add actual research, adopted children being more prone to behave in ways their parents act (be it negative or positive) is likely, even if the kid is given away at birth. Genetics has a big difference, its not small or minutea. "Genetics is the gun Environment just pulls the trigger."

All of your research should also be either about twins, or adopted most likely "Guns don't kill people, people do"- I'm sure you have seen the shirt somewhere, a tool is only as good as it's master. /me withholds joke about ppl being tools slightly. wink Evidence of health problems associated has been cited, the fact that genetics is not linear has been cited and many other valid arguments against eugenics. Do you think you need to link to somewhere for evidence? No, you have to give some analogous argument that has some credible logic behind it and this is what is lacking for LightLink. Much like your gun analogy but something actually credible and decisive is what is neccessary.

If there is a reason why it was never really a debate it would be because of the inadequate arguments given for eugenics.

Quote from: LightLink on November 21, 2005, 06:51:29 PM

Quote

Does sterilization of those convicted of crime produce an overall improvement in the human genetic pool?

I responded to this with more than "It makes sense to me." Namely that if we get rid of the instances in which they are bad, when they are bad, they are free to go so long as they do not end up being negative. If the same gene is good sometimes, and bad sometimes, getting rid of the bad times would make it less likely to occur normaly. Therefore, if it leads to killing, and something dumb like civil rights, then it can be free to frolic on the civil rights side of things, since that one is not as extreem as when it leads to killing.

I'm quite sure there are many fine genetic specimens with high intellect and physical prowess that just happen to be criminals as they had no other means in which to support themself or get out of the trap of a certain lifestyles. You could argue they

weren't all that smart if they couldn't get out, but you have no idea of the lifestyle they lived. If a person has no opportunity no matter how smart or strong they would have been they get nowhere. Now you throw them in a prison they get alot more opportunity then they had. You see these people all they have ever known is crime they don't know anything else.

What makes sense to you seems to be completely void of logic in this argument
LightLink.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we ar born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to percieve.

Try Tachyon[/URL

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #121 on: November 22, 2005, 01:19:40 AM »

Quote

Simply refusing to accept reality and living in your own doesn't make you right, just ignorant.

Am I experiencing deja vu?! Tell me, someone - does this logic not sound like it has been used by another person, in this thread?

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm

Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with

explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #122 on: November 22, 2005, 05:41:23 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 21, 2005, 06:51:29 PM

Quote

Does sterilization of those convicted of crime produce an overall improvement in the human genetic pool?

I responded to this with more than "It makes sense to me." Namely that if we get rid of the instances in which they are bad, when they are bad, they are free to go so long as they do not end up being negative. If the same gene is good sometimes, and bad sometimes, getting rid of the bad times would make it less likely to occur normally. Therefore, if it leads to killing, and something dumb like civil rights, then it can be free to frolic on the civil rights side of things, since that one is not as extreme as when it leads to killing.

For the moment I'll ignore the statement "something dumb like civil rights"...

Again, I will reemphasize, you have not demonstrated either that a change will occur, or that if it does, it is a positive change. If there were a gene that in some situations creates a tendency toward aggressive acts like killing, and in other situations creates a tendency toward rebellious acts promoting civil rights, then reducing that gene will reduce both of those, not just one. Therefore, you have not established that it will be an exclusively positive change, nor an overall positive change.

But it is of course quite evident that if we do a better job of promoting the right situations for children to grow up in, then we'll have many more civil rights leaders, and many fewer criminals.

Quote from: dreamingcarnage

telling him he needs sources and research and not giving any of your own is the same thing, you both are the different sides of the same coin

Example sources showing unemployment as a major predictor of crime:

<http://www.cepr.org/press/DP2129.htm>

<http://www.gunsandcrime.org/bcstudy.html>

<http://ideas.repec.org/a/ucp/jlawec/v44y2001i1p259-83.html>

<http://ideas.repec.org/p/cpr/ceprdp/2129.html>

Example sources showing family structure as a major predictor of crime:

<http://www.enotes.com/single-parent-families-article/39900>

<http://www.townhall.com/opinion/columns/johnleo/2005/09/26/155702.html>

Many of these sources also show that improvements to unemployment and family structure correspond to substantial subsequent improvements in crime rates.

flips the coin Your turn. Now you provide evidence that sterilization of those convicted of crime will produce an "overall improvement" in the human gene pool.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Aurafire

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1173

Karma: 63

Village Idiot

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #123 on: November 22, 2005, 07:00:53 PM »

Alright, I'm not sure how much of this has been mentioned, because this is a 9 page argument and I have to papers to start working on tonight.

This sounds much more like a nature/nurture debate. Notice most of the criminals are of the same culture? Like say you take the inner city of San Diego, and compare it to the amount of criminals from Beverly Hills. Now obviously there's different populations within these groups, but from a proportionate amount it's likely that there's going to be more criminals in the inner city of San Diego.

If this debate is purely nature/nurture it would never end, anyone could tell you that there is no exact explanation for a person say going from a normal person to a criminal. Also, the crime can be committed under a certain setting. Say maybe you were in New Orleans just after hurricane Katrina and you needed food, would you loot? Would you kill if you felt it was necessary? Different situations can cause people to ACT differently and commit these crimes. The point I'm making is that some criminals aren't so different from you and I or Joe the neighbor down the street, so this is also a factor. Being safe about it and not allowing a criminal to pass on his seed is easy to write off as safe, but it

doesn't really do justice to all circumstances.

Logged

Patience is never inherited nor acquired, but only practiced everyday.

dreamingcarnage

Greenhorn

Settling In

*

Posts: 25

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #124 on: November 23, 2005, 12:36:22 AM »

Quote

flips the coin Your turn. Now you provide evidence that sterilization of those convicted of crime will produce an "overall improvement" in the human gene pool.

See, I can't truly. Statistics are based upon historical evidence, if there is no precedence of it occurring and lasting how can there be statistical evidence? The most recent attempts that were widespread were by gov'ts that didn't last so their efforts couldn't be studied (most famous example being Nazi's) because of the violence of it. My true point wasn't in the stance of what people here consider Eugenics, it was just that, you shouldn't 'yell' at someone for lack of research and then not show any of your own, as that would be [similar to but not exactly] hypocritical.

Also, you can essentially disregard any 'eugenics' case before the knowledge of genetics because they weren't based on looking at people's genome or genotype of criminal actions but on a more subjective basis. So that would make it more difficult. Also since almost all Behavioral genes are polygenetic and multifactoral traits to simply "Sterilize the population of people who have it" is essentially impossible because several of the genes govern more than one action, and if you have say a violence gene it would most likely have several other functions. Polygenetic traits are traits determined by more than one gene. Multifactoral trait is a trait or illness that is determined by several genes and the environment. Mendelian genetics where one gene does one thing (example would be earlobes being attached or free standing, if you have the "Dominant" allele your lobes won't be attached "no matter what") is pretty rare/uncommon. Even then combinations for such things as anger are within every single person.

However, since Schizophrenia is known to be relatively heritable.

<http://www.mirecc.org/mindview.shtml> (pretty comprehensive). And as criminal acts

based on people with schizophrenia, one might say removing them would improve the population as crimes by schizophrenics would be lessened. (I'm not trying to give the impression that I am for eugenics in the sense of sterilization, no, I believe in eugenics of improvement through breeding but on an individual basis, e.g. mate with the 'best' person you can, however ambitious great people attract me so it goes well I know not everyone is like this)

Also, one might worry about drug addiction and want to sterilize drug addicts so they won't pass it on. http://www.drugabuse.gov/NIDA_Notes/NNVol12N4/Promising.html

Note that both of these, are still being researched. That's genetics, it's not set-in-stone/already studied. Genetic effects are barely researched as it is recent/new/being developed, sociological are however more thoroughly studied..

* as a rule, there is no such thing as 'all' in genetics/biology, there are [for example] a variety of degrees of dominance, some of which despite having the gene it doesn't show.

Quote

"Guns don't kill people, people do"- I'm sure you have seen the shirt somewhere, a tool is only as good as its master. /me withholds joke about ppl being tools slightly. wink Evidence of health problems associated has been cited, the fact that genetics is not linear has been cited and many other valid arguments against eugenics.

Do you think you need to link to somewhere for evidence? No, you have to give some analogous argument that has some credible logic behind it and this is what is lacking for LightLink. Much like your gun analogy but something actually credible and decisive is what is necessary.

If there is a reason why it was never really a debate it would be because of the inadequate arguments given for eugenics.

"Homicide rates tend to be related to firearm ownership levels. Everything else being equal, a reduction in the percentage of households owning firearms should occasion a drop in the homicide rate".

Evidence to the Cullen Inquiry 1996: Thomas Gabor, Professor of Criminology - University of Ottawa

So not owning a gun, leads to less fatalities by guns. So If we use my 'analogy' of Genes are the gun and environment pulls the trigger and we removed the gun (e.g. certain genes) from the populace, there would be less "Fatalities" e.g. crimes that are associated with said gene. (this is of course, if there was a gene/genes that were uniquely appropriated in criminal majority but in populace minority).

I agree, linear is a problem if you want to sterilize people to remove genes from the populace, because, genetics is complicated. Mendelian simplicity works on very few

things, especially in animals. The only real valid argument is that just having the genes doesn't mean you'll do it but that's a HUGE reason to not sterilize/gene removal.

'Do you think you need to link to somewhere for evidence?' I believe so if available, or if you cite their is evidence you should show it. Partially because of the very nature of statistics and their interpretability and people find it interesting and should not go simply on the faith of an unknown interneteer. If you can not give evidence and you are going by logic alone, just explain your logic with as much detail as possible. It's like a basic English assignment, you write everything out as if you were talking to an idiot/alien explaining everything so that it's easily graspable and it isn't a guessing game. Which is one of the reasons my posts are long. Also, in reference to my analogy, that wasn't mine, that was told to me by a geneticist. An ACTUAL geneticist who's done field research, in some flower or something, but a geneticist none the less. Also it is credible, since I haven't seen anyone give any knowledge surpassing my own in genetics period, on both sides of the argument, I'll assume I am the most credible (as I've taken a class in genetic principles at least). Also, it is credible because a. it's I believe a relatively accepted idea by geneticists. b. the analogy works as many genes are environmentally stimulated, certain forms of cancer for example (many are in relation to a carcinogen that mutates the P53 gene which accounts for about 50 percent of human cancers {be it a deletion or a point mutation}). I'm paraphrasing from Human Genetics Concepts and Applications sixth edition by Ricki Lewis) So I don't understand why the analogy wasn't credible. Decisiveness being a more subjective idea and me not really knowing what you expect 'my' analogy to be decisive on means I can't really respond, please clarify.

It wasn't a debate because no one was looking truly objectively at the subject matter. People were also being offended and not thinking rationally. As I saw it anyways. Also not knowing anything about genetics, genetically related behaviors makes it of course biased towards socio-economics reasons. Of course there are socio-economic reasons, no one ever said that wasn't a huge factor. However, no one can say there WOULDN'T be an improvement in crime rates if a specific and well formulated sterilization plan was created that was attune to solid genetic "problems" that were based not on a law but on an ethical principle that is considered heinous and serious e.g. certain violent crimes that could be found to be hereditary. However there isn't enough information for or against. The only true information is to say that there is a sociological and economic reasonings for crime, genetics is too fledgling to be able to defend itself.

Quote

This sounds much more like a nature/nurture debate. Notice most of the criminals are of the same culture? Like say you take the inner city of San Diego, and compare it to the amount of criminals from Beverly Hills. Now obviously there's different populations within these groups, but from a proportionate amount it's likely that there's going to be more criminals in the inner city of San Diego.

"Not necessarily, because certain crimes have different levels. Drug use for example is
white students (39.5%) and black students (33.6%)
students residing in suburban areas (39.5%), urban areas (33.7%), and rural areas

(34.3%) "

-<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/dcf/du.htm>

By stereotype most would think blacks are more likely, as well as urban, but white suburban kids are the most likely to use drugs. However that's just drugs, and since most criminal acts that lead to prison are drugs and drugs are probably a lot less caught than killing a man. You could say drug use is a lot more probable so there is probably more criminality in Beverly Hills per person. This however is by no means accurate just a likely possibility.

<http://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/library/basicfax.htm#q17> (says most criminals are in for drug possession)

« Last Edit: November 23, 2005, 02:13:12 AM by solstice » Logged

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588

Karma: 1

Pinkus Elephantus

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #125 on: November 25, 2005, 09:06:18 PM »

You don't do things just because no one could say if it would or wouldn't.

If you take away genes you take away people, without people we certainly have no crime so once again "PURGE THE EARTH OF THE UNCLEAR" where do they come from these people? Others prejudice and what do we have here in this debate?

Prejudice.

This idea has very negative health effects, anything would make a difference in crime rates to present this as something that is golden and a good idea above others is completely illogical.

Personally I probably won't be having children, it would concern other people to have such a right taken away.

Basically some people believe their sole purpose here is to propagate the species, if you take that away from them they have nothing so what stops them from being incredibly destructive.

Someone with nothing is free to do anything such as walking into a hospital nursery and suicide bombing it.

You are dealing with not too well configured in the head people here.

What's to stop someone doing that kind of thing now not much, but what other factors are there not being taken into account?

If you are working on the side of it would lower crime and don't take into account how it might instead increase it you are limiting your perspective.

Eugenics is about taking from someone in need, this may pass with sexual offenders as chemical castration is possibly something that is already done in such cases where the offender wants to stop. A killer is generally different circumstances.

I'm pretty sure a better idea will present itself rather soon, I do like the idea of hypnotherapy

What is so offensive about anothers confusion in insulting others, a judgement is completely limited projection of ones own reasonings which holds no weight in the light of a scrutinous introspective persons knowledge of themself.

It merely shows a lack of tempement and a defensive stand-point which pretty much screams you are losing this debate as soon as such a thing occurs.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we ar born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to percieve.

Try Tachyon[/URL

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #126 on: November 28, 2005, 09:55:50 AM »

Yall done gone off withought me.

Let us see, some of yall are going off on a tangent. Kobok, that is not evidence, considering nobody is contesting the fact that economic and social factors contribute to crime. As has been stated several times before. You have provided evidence for something nobody is arguing against.

I am one of those people who believes that ones sole purpose is to have children and pass genes. It is our only sure-fire way of any sort of physical immortality. If it was taken

away, I certainly would not become destructive...more like, depressed and wishing to die. But then I would have a large incentive to not commit a crime now would I not?

As to kobok saying it is time to produce evidence, how can I when there are no studies. Never has anybody tried, that we can look at. If there is, point it out to me.

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #127 on: November 29, 2005, 09:20:47 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 28, 2005, 09:55:50 AM

As to kobok saying it is time to produce evidence, how can I when there are no studies. Never has anybody tried, that we can look at. If there is, point it out to me.

It's incorrect to say this has not been studied or tried. In fact, the idea of eugenics has been thoroughly studied, tried, and beaten to death by society long before you were born, and it has been found to be without scientific merit.

Logged
Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

dreamingcarnage

Greenhorn

Settling In

*

Posts: 25
Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #128 on: November 29, 2005, 01:42:12 PM »

The problem Kobok, is that your links are bad (mainly the first, the second is okay/good but the relation towards the subject isn't exactly 'concrete'); not in that they don't work but in that they don't prove the point you were trying to make. I said this before, but reading my posts is apparently difficult, that the Eugenics proposed [by Lightlink] hasn't been tested. The Public Eye's entire page is essentially 'useless' [to this discussion] because it has nothing to do with genetics, People believing there were genetic ties because they saw the phenotype (that means visible trait) and saw 'hereditary' similarities means nothing, it wasn't genetically verified. Also, they used Mendelian genetics, which as a rule behavioral genes to not follow as I said before, Mendelian genetics only work on single factor/function genes. 1 gene expressed 1 thing. This is rare in humans. Also, most of it dealt with Race. Most educated Americans know that Race is a social/cultural construct and has no real barring on anything (as your second site also states). Lightlink never said by Race he said simply by action of criminality. But Criminality doesn't mean the gene is present, it could conclude (if say a gene can be blamed for committing so and so types of crime) that they should be tested for it, and if they have it, Sterilization.

Meaning:

I commit a crime

I get caught

I committed rape*

I am tested and the 'Rape' gene is found to be prominent in my genome (a rape gene is discovered to be rooted towards a gene on chromosome 14)

People can rape without having the gene, but because it has created a predisposition and 10 percent of rapes are committed by people with said R gene.

Sterilization is chosen, so I can't pass on the R gene that could create future rapes. as well as microinjection gene therapy to remove the r gene from me so I won't be as behaviorally inclined towards rape (if possible).

This is theory. Genetics isn't that far ahead.

That HASN'T been studied, or tried, or tested. (or beaten to death)

Eugenics based on race has been. I agree.

Quote

The issue is not, are there native abilities, but rather, can we at present know anything scientifically about them.

Lightlinks entire point is based on future possibility that a genetic relation to certain behaviors is measurable. It's not yet.

You are incorrect to say it has been tried and beaten down (his form of eugenics).

Also, Jonathan Marks doesn't say that eugenics is without scientific merit, he says that the scientific merit isn't strong enough yet (basically). Also he says "hey, bad deeds

don't mean bad genes". Of course, environment has a good chunk of effect, but if there is a genetic criminality. Removing the genes could lower crime rate. Like breeding dogs, breeders ween animals overtime out of aggressive and other behavioral traits. Humans are just more complicated.

I apologize if a lot of this doesn't make sense, I'm really drowsy from Pain medication.

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #129 on: November 29, 2005, 03:23:45 PM »

Quote from: dreamingcarnage on November 29, 2005, 01:42:12 PM

The problem Kobok, is that your links are bad (mainly the first, the second is okay/good but the relation towards the subject isn't exactly 'concrete'); not in that they don't work but in that they don't prove the point you were trying to make. I said this before, but reading my posts is apparently difficult, that the Eugenics proposed [by Lightlink] hasn't been tested. The Public Eye's entire page is essentially 'useless' [to this discussion] because it has nothing to do with genetics, People believing there were genetic ties because they saw the phenotype (that means visible trait) and saw 'hereditary' similarities means nothing, it wasn't genetically verified.

...

That HASN'T been studied, or tried, or tested. (or beaten to death)

Maybe you should read it all the way through, because your statement that it does not address poverty or criminality is incorrect. In fact, the quote at the very top of the page addresses the article as being about both poverty and criminality. And sterilization based on these principles was indeed tried, and sadly so.

The first link I gave above simply addresses the history of the eugenics movement (as a response to the claim that it has never been studied), while the second page addresses the scientific flaws of eugenics.

In case you were wondering, the second page was written by Dr. Jonathon Marks, an evolutionary geneticist and anthropologist. For background, here are his recent publications (some of which are interesting reading). As you can see, this is his area of expertise, and his essay is backed by a solid understanding of the subject matter.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

dreamingcarnage

Greenhorn

Settling In

*

Posts: 25

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #130 on: November 30, 2005, 10:34:20 AM »

No, its not, It mainly deals with Racism and classism which have an effect on Criminality. Closer to the bottom, (beginning of the second half) is where it deals with Behavioral Genes. (referring to the second link)

You would want a study on Genes that CAUSE criminality.

You showed a link that showed Traits (with no truly verifiable genetic relation) among cultural classes and races that were -erroneously- believed to have a genetic link and how it was incorrect. Eugenics made a mistake and thought culture structures (like class) had a distinct genetic background. Ex. being poor was genetic though certain genetic traits like certain forms of mental retardation could lead to them being poor, there is no "poor" gene. Etc etc.

That was essentially what both talked about.

He's (lightlink) not saying Eugenics in that way, that was incorrect and not really based on genetics. Which both your links said essentially. They have no bearing. Because they both say the early eugenics programs had really no relation to true genetics. How are they considered studies on real eugenics. Specifically eugenics through the look at behavioral genetics.

The second page addresses the scientific flaws of the Eugenics programs that were mentioned in the 1st link, but because that form of Eugenics is not the Eugenics being discussed here it has no true bearing.

I think its pretty obvious that I knew who he was (as If you actually read my whole post [which I dont think you ever do] you would of seen that I said his name).

I also never said he wasnt credible (though, just for your information, after 8th grade its in bad form to use sources that old [9 yrs]). I never said it wasnt credible, I also didnt denounce what he said, but he doesn't argue really against the type of Eugenics lightlink mentioned, (he does, sorta, in that he considers it erroneous logic and doesnt think predispositions should be punished (essentially minority report) but he says behavioral genes are too much in infancy to be of any use and he also gave the same warnings that were given in this thread. (e.g saying bad genes dont make bad deeds)

Nevermind, no one reads anything I say so it doesnt matter/I'm not going to bother.
« Last Edit: November 30, 2005, 10:38:38 AM by dreamingcarnage » Logged
solstice

Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics
« Reply #131 on: November 30, 2005, 11:54:38 AM »
That's the spirit!

Logged
Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.
Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

SleepWalker
Pool Boy
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 588
Karma: 1

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #132 on: November 30, 2005, 01:04:25 PM »

hehe, this isn't going anywhere, once one of your points has been countered you cannot use it again. Repeating yourself might work when you want to guilt trip someone into doing something for you, but it doesn't fly in this discussion.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[/URL

ShiningDragon

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #133 on: November 30, 2005, 02:31:43 PM »

Wow seriously why won't you just let it die. We all understand that the Eugenics proposed a long time ago will not work, but Lightlink's Eugenics, being the genius he is, is perfect. We cannot begin to comprehend his incredible genius and therefore we are idiots. We cannot prove him wrong because there are no studies that have disproved his theory. This is of course because it is the lightlink version of life and he can't be wrong because he has successfully studied the topic thousands of times and for years of his life. He has researched his ideas and performed experiments to back up his claims; he is a genius among us all. He must be right because all the other scientists that have researched this are wrong!

Hmmm..

Yea right.

Logged

"The church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church." - Ferdinand Magellan

And you shall cry tears of crimson...

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Political_Topics

15 captures

3 Jul 2008 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Political Topics

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

US Wiretapping

Thoughts on America

Who Actually Votes for Bush?

American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

Congress vs. Online Communities

Stem Cell Research

Terrorists Arrested in Canada

FBI Raid Capitol Hill

Category: Significant Forum Topics

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 09:47. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Christianity_and_Metaphysics

14 captures

12 May 2008 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Christianity and Metaphysics](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

[Debates](#)

[circa August 2006](#)

[circa June 2007](#)

[Christian Thinking](#)

[Christian Behavior](#)

[Explaining Christianity's Relationship to Metaphysics](#)

[God/Jesus and Magic](#)

[Categories: Significant Forum TopicsReligion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

Help
Search
Search

Tools

What links here
Related changes
Special pages
Printable version
Permanent link
Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 25 July 2007, at 15:43. Privacy policy About Veritas
Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=10604.0>

4 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Jun JUL Aug

18

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 18, 2014, 01:37:10 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

215001 Posts in 15323 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most
online today: 123 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ Discussion Areas

| | -+ Magick

| | | -+ Christianity and Magick are Compatable 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this
topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 8 Print

Author Topic: Christianity and Magick are Compatable (Read 14131 times)

CyberDemon08

Settling In

*

Posts: 34

Karma: 0

Scientia est potestas

[View Profile](#)

Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« on: June 12, 2007, 12:49:17 PM »

Christianity and the Esoteric

Christianity has a long history of opposition to esoteric matters. In its earliest days it was forced to compete with prior, pagan religions for adherents and power. Eventually, by virtue of having the most soldiers sworn to its cause, it managed to destroy many of the old religions; it destroyed the Druids, the original pagans and drove what it could not destroy underground. It warred within itself, too, as seen in the destruction of the gnostics, Essenes, and the mystics of its own faith. The Protestant Reformation and the Great Schism between Rome and Constantinople split the faith. And yet Christianity has endured the centuries to ascend to prominence. Why? Because, in spite of man-made flaws, caused by willful ignorance and the arrogance of those who use the religion as a road to material gain, Christ himself had one simple message: Love thy neighbor as thyself. A Christian is one who emulates Christ, therefore the work he did, of healing, of feeding the poor and alleviating suffering is the work with which the religion is obligated to continue. A Christian should also aspire to emulate the power of God as revealed through men, therefore men are permitted and encouraged by Christianity to study the esoteric, the mystic, the metaphysical.

Misconceptions over Scripture

Many fundamentalists read in scripture that "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." And they shall use this as a rallying cry against those who are inclined to the Mysteries. Unfortunately, they are wrong. The Original Hebrew word used for witch was m'khaseph, denoting the use of sorcery to harm another. This applies neither to magic nor to Wicca.

The ever popular Deut. 18:10-12 reads: There shall not be found among you any one who burns his son or his daughter as an offering, any one who practices divination, a soothsayer, or an augur, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a medium, or a wizard, or a

necromancer. For whoever does these things is an abomination to the LORD; and because of these abominable practices the LORD your God is driving them out before you.

Clearly, translators have had a great deal of difficulty selecting unique English words or short phrases to match the 8 original Hebrew words:

yid'oni Making contact with spirits (not of God).

sho'el 'ov Making contact with the dead .

qosem q'samim Foretelling the future by using lots or a similar system.

m'onen Predicting the future by interpreting signs in nature.

m'nachesh Enchanting (perhaps related to nachash, a snake).

chover chavar Casting spells by magical knot tying.

m'khaseph evil sorcery; using spoken spells to harm other people.

doresh 'el hametim "One who asks the dead", probably via another method than sho'el 'ov

This ignores the simple fact, however, that the OT applies only to the ancient Israelites and their descendants, and has no bearing on a modern-day Christian, except as history.

Arguments and Counter-Arguments

Standard argument: "Magic is evil. The Bible says so."

Counter-argument: "This statement is based on mistranslations of culturally-unique conceptions or outright forgery, and is false."

Standard Argument: "The Bible is inerrant. It is the revealed Word of God."

Counter-argument: "The Bible did not arrive as a fax from heaven: It is a human-chosen collection of certain texts which were already very old at the time of their selection. The Bible, such as exists today, was created by fallible humans."

Standard Argument: "Jesus did no magic, they were miracles."

Counter-argument: "Two names for the same thing. A Christian Magician seeks to perform miracles by regulating his actions and mind in such a fashion as to make himself a suitable vessel for God's will and power.

Standard Argument: "Magic arouses the ego, and that is a tool of Satan."

Counter-argument: "The aim of most kinds of magic is to purify and reunite the soul with God."

Standard Argument: "Magic is unscientific."

Counter-argument: "So is religion in general. Faith means belief without proof."

Magic in the Bible

- * Samson increased his strength by growing his hair long.
- * Moses brought victory by raising his arms
- * Moses healed by lifting up a bronze snake.
- * Joseph divined through dream interpretation and a divining cup. .
- * Joshua stopped the Jordan by touching it with a Holy item.
- * The Priests divined by casting the Urim and Thurim.
- * Jacob increased his flocks by mating them in front of reeds
- * Elisha healed Naaman through a complex ritual of washing.
- * Prophets divined by having harps played.
- * Daniel interpreted dreams.
- * James taught healing by anointing with oil.
- * Paul healed by blessing handkerchiefs and sending them out.
- * Peter healed by his shadow.
- * The Eleven divined the 12th Apostle by casting lots.

What appears to be so, is that magic is a God-given ability and as permissible as prayer, when used to beneficial ends. God gives us the ability to mold reality, and today, when the prophets of old no longer walk amongst us, we must resort to the techniques of magic. Jesus has no hands on earth but ours, so we must take up his power for the good of all.

Resources

<http://www.religioustolerance.org/inerrant.htm>

http://www.religioustolerance.org/wic_bibl.htm

http://www.religioustolerance.org/divin_bibl.htm

Copyright 2007, Aaron K Meighen

« Last Edit: July 07, 2010, 09:24:18 AM by CyberDemon08 » Logged

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #1 on: June 12, 2007, 01:13:08 PM »

You are not noting some of the Qabalah in the Bible, such as was the case with Moses lifting up the snake. However, overall the mini-article is good.

Namaste

Logged

Produce Stand

Settling In

*

Posts: 23

Karma: 0

Yeahhhh

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #2 on: June 12, 2007, 01:22:18 PM »

Ah, but I think there is something about it in the New Testament, I just don't remember where.

Logged

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3290

Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Christians shouldn't need magic.

« Reply #3 on: June 12, 2007, 01:33:22 PM »

According to the bible, the power of the Spirit of God will rest upon those people who come to God in faith through Jesus. The power of God.

If this promise is true, then there is no need for magic. If this promise is false, then Christianity is based on lies and should be disregarded regardless of whether it is compatible with magic.

This was even taught in the original qabalah, which was written down in the Talmud [Edit]well, the part about coming through jesus was obviously not in the talmud[/Edit]:

He who enquireth of an ob — is that not the same as one that consulteth the dead?18 — As has been taught: Or that consulteth the dead: this means one who starves himself and spends the night in a cemetery, so that an unclean spirit [of a demon] may rest upon him [to enable him to foretell the future]. And when R. Akiba reached this verse, he wept: If one who starves himself that an unclean spirit may rest upon him has his wish granted, he who fasts that the pure spirit [the Divine Presence] may rest upon him — how much more should his desire be fulfilled! But alas!19 our sins have driven it away20 from us, as it is written, But your iniquities have separated between you and your God.21

http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_65.html

~Steve

« Last Edit: June 12, 2007, 09:02:22 PM by Steve » Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Veos

Teacher Emeritus

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 473

Karma: 37

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #4 on: June 12, 2007, 02:10:57 PM »

Magick being evil is a christian concept, not a Jewish one. Most of the traditional Jews acknowledged mysticism, and believed that much of the Bible was comprised of Mystic Teachings. The christian Mystic believes in a similar thing with the New Testament. Most of these teachings of Christ and the hidden teachings in the Old Testament are considered Kabbalistical in nature, and the Midrash and Talmud help to expand upon much of these teachings of the Tanakh. The common argument against the Kabbalah and Christ is that many believe the Kabbalah originated several hundred years after Christ. However, there are a large amount of scholars who have found references to books such as the Sefer Yetzirah and the Book of Raziel in Jewish Mystic Writings dating back to about 100 B.C. Aside from this, The Jews were excellent at containing Oral teachings and passing them down for hundreds of years. The Hebrew

word Kabbalah generally denotes an oral transmission of knowledge, hinting at its existence before any rabbi ever endeavored to write out any of its teachings.

As far as the Bible being written by fallable men, this is true to some extent with the exception of the Torah. It is generally believed that the Torah already existed before the Creation of the World, and that God revealed it to Moses, most likely through a type of inspirational writing. In such a case, the Torah was no more written by Moses than an "automatic writing" is written by the medium, or the "Rosicrucian Cosmo-Conception" was written by Max Heindel. They can't claim authorship, because the material was not theirs. Aside from this, the Jewish systems of magic and mysticism revolve around the idea that the Bible (Old Testament) is perfect, and that every Hebrew letter and spelling has multiple meanings both in and out of context. This has been clearly demonstrated in many of the Kabbalistic books from the Ari school, such as the Zohar.

all in all, a nice little article. Good job.

~Veos

P.S: concerning the comments of Steve, as it was undoubtedly inevitable he would have something to say (which I thank him for due to his knowledge of the Bible). Still, he takes up a Cross into battle, and I take up a Wand!

Quote from: Steve on June 12, 2007, 01:33:22 PM

According to the Bible, the power of the Spirit of God will rest upon those people who come to God in faith through Jesus. The power of God.

It is hardly fair to the Jews to call the New Testament "The Bible", but that is irrelevant. The "Power of the Spirit of God" I assume to mean the Holy Spirit, which is an aspect of the Shekinah? This "receiving of the Holy Spirit" is mystical in nature, as Christ clearly demonstrates in calling himself the Bridegroom, as the Holy Spirit itself is feminine in nature, while the spirit is masculine, and thus such a "marriage" has almost always implied a mystical union between man and God. Such a union is achieved by the Yogis of the East, who also have this mystical marriage in uniting the Kundalini with Siva. Such Yogis can perform all the miracles that Christ is recorded to have performed. In fact, such abilities are actual side-effects to the actual process of enlightenment and their Yogis teach that these abilities (such as walking on water, levitation, etc.) are evil in that they distract the mystic from God. To receive the power of the Spirit of God is to literally receive the Spirit of God itself. In Christianity, this results from intense devotion and religious practice, which is called "Jnana Yoga" in the East, in which the Yogi obtains this mystical marriage through intense devotion. In observing the teachings of Christianity, the Chakras themselves start to awaken from the intense influx of spiritual energy. If you choose not to believe that, then that is fine, but the whole process can be quite easily observed by the clairvoyant. Particularly religious people who actually have received the whole spirit have up to the Anahata Chakra awakened, of which the original awakening of this chakra is almost always

accompanied by a vision of Christ, since he is the Ishta Devata of this chakra. Particularly gifted people who have already received the Holy Spirit raise it from the anahata to the Vishuddha Chakra (located in the throat) to attain the gift of Prophecy and divine knowledge of Scripture.

where does all of this play into magick? I have just stated that the receiving of such "divine powers" and union with God is attainable completely without magick, and can be attained with strict devotion and fervor towards Christ. However, the magician chooses to achieve the same union, but instead of only being concerned with his god, he explores the Universe, and thus actually explores more of God than he would have. the magician gains a first-hand experience of his creation and its magnificence.

Quote from: Steve on June 12, 2007, 01:33:22 PM

If this promise is true, then there is no need for magic. If this promise is false, then Christianity is based on lies and should be disregarded regardless of whether it is compatible with magic.

This is a logical fallacy. It is equivalent to saying "the cup holder broke, thus the entire car is broke", or "the Tires are in perfect condition, so the entire car is in perfect condition".

Quote from: Steve on June 12, 2007, 01:33:22 PM

This was even taught in the original qabalah, which was written down in the Talmud:

He who enquireth of an ob — is that not the same as one that consulteth the dead?¹⁸ — As has been taught: Or that consulteth the dead: this means one who starves himself and spends the night in a cemetery, so that an unclean spirit [of a demon] may rest upon him [to enable him to foretell the future]. And when R. Akiba reached this verse, he wept: If one who starves himself that an unclean spirit may rest upon him has his wish granted, he who fasts that the pure spirit [the Divine Presence] may rest upon him — how much more should his desire be fulfilled! But alas!¹⁹ our sins have driven it away²⁰ from us, as it is written, But your iniquities have separated between you and your God.²¹

This is clearly a degraded act of Sorcery, of which everybody agrees is wrong according to the Bible. A magician would never concern himself by talking to the shells of the dead, and out of respect would not disturb the dead themselves for such trivial matters.

Logged

Soham Sivoham Aham Brahma Asmi Mahavakya

Suddha satchitananda purna parabrahma

Chidananda Rupa Sivoham Sivoham

solstice
Dreamwalker
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2114
Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #5 on: June 12, 2007, 03:38:14 PM »

Quote

If this promise is true, then there is no need for magic. If this promise is false, then Christianity is based on lies and should be disregarded regardless of whether it is compatible with magic.

What? No! Christianity could not possibly be built on lies...

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

CyberDemon08

Settling In

*

Posts: 34
Karma: 0

Scientia est potestas

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #6 on: June 12, 2007, 05:22:01 PM »

Produce Stand, you are correct that witchcraft is mentioned in the NT. The Greek is pharmakia, implying a poisoner. Steve, your concerns are addressed in the writing: "Two names for the same thing. A Christian Magician seeks to perform miracles by regulating his actions and mind in such a fashion as to make himself a suitable vessel for God's will and power." Magic is nothing more than making the human soul a suitable

vessel through which God may enact that which may be called miraculous by the ignorant. The use of magic does not preclude a belief in Christ as Savior. To all, thanks for the words of kindness.

Logged
Julianus
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 313
Karma: 1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #7 on: June 13, 2007, 08:38:12 AM »

Quote

Magic is nothing more than making the human soul a suitable vessel through which God may enact that which may be called miraculous by the ignorant.

From the Hermetic standpoint, magic does not operate exclusively by the power of God. Magic is knowledge of which laws bind the universe and how may the magician work with these laws so as, firstly, to bring himself closer to God by obtaining such wisdom and, secondly, to use this knowledge so as to enhance the quality of his life.

However, old Hermetic teachings state that the Universe is but a mental creation of the All, what is commonly referred as God. This is where CyberDemon08 might have based his thesis.

But may we safely presume that the entire Universe is a part of God? An adoption of such an idea would not be valid because, as it is also stated above, the Universe is mental. Let us, for instance, think of a writer. Does he create worlds into his mind? He does. Are these worlds an actual part of him? It is clear that they are not but this world is rather an emanation from but not an actual part of himself. According to the principle of correspondence this also applies to God and the creation of the Universe. In other words, we are like the characters of a novel in an author's mind who live, move and have their being on the "universe" he has created.

So, the mental Universe operates under certain principles and what the magician does is that he works with them instead of using the power of the All. However, there are cases that God can intervene at times but take into consideration that God is different from the All. God is like an emanation of the All into Its mental Universe. How can we understand this better? Doesn't the author of a novel describes the plot, the places, the heroes, etc.? Philosophically, this could not be the author himself but an emanation of him into his "universe" and there he, as an observer - as the God in his "universe" so to

speak-, he sees things and intervenes by making the plot. Therefore, the "God" who can intervene in our mental Universe is nothing but an emanation of the All and not the All, per se, and He can be "used" so as to enhance the magician's operation (a prayer is a common example of this).

By the way, it was a nicely written article and it appeared to be rather informative to me concerning the faulty translation of certain Jewish terms in the Bible.

Logged

A thorough familiarity with the occult faculties of everything existing in nature, visible as well as invisible; their mutual relations, attractions, repulsions; the cause of these; in other words a profound and exhaustive knowledge of natural law – this was and is the basis of magic.

- Blavatsky

CyberDemon08

Settling In

*

Posts: 34

Karma: 0

Scientia est potestas

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #8 on: June 13, 2007, 09:42:29 AM »

I freely admit that I am not a student of Hermetics, and I have only a passing acquaintance with those teachings. The article was my attempt to reconcile Protestant Christianity, as commonly practiced in America, with the practice of magic. Hermeticism is based largely on the premise of the use of magic to reunite with the All, in so far as I understand, so it needs no reconciliation. I wrote the article with the mindset of trying to explain why magic is not wrong, but Godly to a fundamentalist Protestant Christian. And yes, I believe magic, like all things, is governed by laws instituted by God (or the All) and that part of "making the human soul a suitable vessel" lies in understanding and applying these laws.

Logged

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3290

Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #9 on: June 13, 2007, 10:09:37 AM »

My point is less "magic should not be done" so much as it is "why bother if God Himself will give you power?" If you're doing it for power, the Judaic/Christian God just gives it away to His truly devoted followers. If it's a close relationship with God, then that's pretty much the same thing, though God places far more importance upon people turning to His ways than He does on giving people power (ie "Seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, and all of these things will be given to you as well.").

The Holy Spirit of God is given to people who have devoted themselves to God, through Jesus, as a seal of the promise that God has given "salvation" (that is, forgiven their sins and once again lives with them) to them through Jesus; this is an oath from Jesus and the apostles in the new testament.

Acts 2:

1When the day of Pentecost came, they were all together in one place. 2Suddenly a sound like the blowing of a violent wind came from heaven and filled the whole house where they were sitting. 3They saw what seemed to be tongues of fire that separated and came to rest on each of them. 4All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues[a] as the Spirit enabled them.

...

22"Men of Israel, listen to this: Jesus of Nazareth was a man accredited by God to you by miracles, wonders and signs, which God did among you through him, as you yourselves know.

...

36"Therefore let all Israel be assured of this: God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ."

37When the people heard this, they were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the other apostles, "Brothers, what shall we do?"

38Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

39The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call."

[a] Acts 2:4 Or languages; also in verse 11

<http://bibleresources.bible.com/passagesearchresults.php?passage1=acts+2&version1=31>

The initial group mentioned in verse one was about 120, according to Acts 1:15, so it was not just the apostles whom initially had the Holy Spirit placed upon them. Why do those who are of a religion that claims devotion to God, desire to use the lesser (man's own power) if the greater (God's power) is made available to those who truly trust in God?

Do not be deceived by the qabalists who claim the Holy Spirit is part of their tradition; what the apostles say, and record Jesus as saying, is vastly different from what the qabalists claim regarding how one receives the Holy Spirit. Jesus and the apostles, and the Torah as well for those who are disinterested in the NT but are still interested in the OT, say it is a gift from God given to those whom God chooses, but the qabalists say it is something within you that you achieve by devotion to magical practices.

* Samson increased his strength by growing his hair long.
because God declared when Samson was not even born that this would be so. Judges 13:

Quote

2 A certain man of Zorah, named Manoah, from the clan of the Danites, had a wife who was sterile and remained childless. 3 The angel of the LORD appeared to her and said, "You are sterile and childless, but you are going to conceive and have a son. 4 Now see to it that you drink no wine or other fermented drink and that you do not eat anything unclean, 5 because you will conceive and give birth to a son. No razor may be used on his head, because the boy is to be a Nazirite, set apart to God from birth, and he will begin the deliverance of Israel from the hands of the Philistines."

* Moses brought victory by raising his arms
And yet, whenever Moses' arms (or, perhaps more poignantly, whenever the Staff of God that Moses made sure to take with him) lowered the Amalekites began winning. God is not specifically mentioned as helping out here, but neither is Moses given the credit in the Torah. Is this not the same, then, as when God told Moses to speak to the rock the first time and yet Moses struck it so God became angry with Moses? Who then is the one with the power? Moses or God?

Exodus 17 for Moses arms.

Numbers 20 for Moses striking the rock and wording it so it seemed like Moses played a part in the miracle, for which God was not pleased:

Quote

6 Moses and Aaron went from the assembly to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting and fell facedown, and the glory of the LORD appeared to them. 7 The LORD said to Moses, 8 "Take the staff, and you and your brother Aaron gather the assembly together. Speak to that rock before their eyes and it will pour out its water. You will bring water out of the rock for the community so they and their livestock can drink."

9 So Moses took the staff from the LORD's presence, just as he commanded him. 10 He and Aaron gathered the assembly together in front of the rock and Moses said to them, "Listen, you rebels, must we bring you water out of this rock?" 11 Then Moses raised his arm and struck the rock twice with his staff. Water gushed out, and the community and their livestock drank.

12 But the LORD said to Moses and Aaron, "Because you did not trust in me enough to honor me as holy in the sight of the Israelites, you will not bring this community into the land I give them."

* Moses healed by lifting up a bronze snake.

Hell no. Numbers 21:

Quote

6 Then the LORD sent venomous snakes among them; they bit the people and many Israelites died. 7 The people came to Moses and said, "We sinned when we spoke against the LORD and against you. Pray that the LORD will take the snakes away from us." So Moses prayed for the people.

8 The LORD said to Moses, "Make a snake and put it up on a pole; anyone who is bitten can look at it and live." 9 So Moses made a bronze snake and put it up on a pole. Then when anyone was bitten by a snake and looked at the bronze snake, he lived.

* Joseph divined through dream interpretation and a divining cup. .

Genesis 40:8 "We both had dreams," they answered, "but there is no one to interpret them." Then Joseph said to them, "Do not interpretations belong to God? Tell me your dreams."

Dreams are one of the few things in "modern magic" which was not outlawed in the Torah, but the bible is very clear that such dreams come from God and moreso the means of understanding them also come from God. Do not forget that Joseph was in Egypt, the magic capital of the world according to us. If Joseph truly learned magic from them, then surely the teachers would be able to do greater things than an acolyte foreigner with a foreign God.

* Joshua stopped the Jordan by touching it with a Holy item.

Joshua 3:

Quote

5 Joshua told the people, "Consecrate yourselves, for tomorrow the LORD will do amazing things among you."

...

7 And the LORD said to Joshua, "Today I will begin to exalt you in the eyes of all Israel, so they may know that I am with you as I was with Moses. 8 Tell the priests who carry the ark of the covenant: 'When you reach the edge of the Jordan's waters, go and stand in the river.' "

...

9 Joshua said to the Israelites, "Come here and listen to the words of the LORD your God. 10 This is how you will know that the living God is among you and that he will certainly drive out before you the Canaanites, Hittites, Hivites, Perizzites, Girgashites, Amorites and Jebusites. 11 See, the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth will go into the Jordan ahead of you.

"15 Now the Jordan is at flood stage all during harvest. Yet as soon as the priests who carried the ark reached the Jordan and their feet touched the water's edge, 16 the water from upstream stopped flowing."

The Ark of the Covenant was a relic that God told the people how to build (Exodus 25:10-22), and decided would be a place where He Himself would sit at times. God took care of it even when it fell into the hands of the Philistines and the Israelites were

nowhere near it. 1Samuel 4 and 1Samuel 5. Which is greater: items fashioned from men, or God who fashioned all of the materials and more that man uses to fashion into items?

God is the one in power, not humans. And the humans who wrote the Torah acknowledged this, so why don't qabalists if you claim to follow the same traditions?

- * The Priests divined by casting the Urim and Thumim.

One of the few practices of "magic" sometimes still practiced today, yet even this flows back to the original use of the term divination where the Divine was still part of the word because the priests were not just throwing coins around by their own power and deciding upon the results, but were asking God to give them an answer through the coins.

- * Jacob increased his flocks by mating them in front of reeds

That was just good wisdom. Knowing the mating rituals of the flocks and the fact that healthy breed healthy whereas unhealthy breed unhealthy. If you want to claim this as magic then you have to put aside the modern definition with it's portrayal of amazing powers and the metaphysical and go back to the "wise man" roots of the word that portrays a very different form of "magic".

- * Elisha healed Naaman through a complex ritual of washing.

2 Kings 5

Quote

14 So he went down and dipped himself in the Jordan seven times, as the man of God had told him, and his flesh was restored and became clean like that of a young boy.

15 Then Naaman and all his attendants went back to the man of God. He stood before him and said, "Now I know that there is no God in all the world except in Israel. Well, that's odd. Why would Naaman glorify YHWH if Elisha was the one taking the credit?

- * Prophets divined by having harps played.

I don't recall this part.

- * Daniel interpreted dreams.

See above with Joseph.

- * James taught healing by anointing with oil.

Quote? I don't recall this and I can't find it with a search.

- * Paul healed by blessing handkerchiefs and sending them out.

Where does this come from?

- * Peter healed by his shadow.

What? o_O ([joke] pics or it didn't happen >_> [/joke])

* The Eleven divined the 12th Apostle by casting lots.
And the fishermen who were ferrying Jonah also cast lots to determine why the sea was so mad, and the lot fell to Jonah. See divination above.

~Steve

Numbers 12

The anger of the LORD burned against them, and he left them.

When the cloud lifted from above the Tent, there stood Miriam—leprous, like snow. Aaron turned toward her and saw that she had leprosy; and he said to Moses, "Please, my lord, do not hold against us the sin we have so foolishly committed. Do not let her be like a stillborn infant coming from its mother's womb with its flesh half eaten away."

So Moses cried out to the LORD, "O God, please heal her!"

The LORD replied to Moses, "If her father had spit in her face, would she not have been in disgrace for seven days? Confine her outside the camp for seven days; after that she can be brought back." So Miriam was confined outside the camp for seven days, and the people did not move on till she was brought back.

« Last Edit: June 13, 2007, 11:00:17 AM by Steve » Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #10 on: June 13, 2007, 10:33:30 AM »

As always Steve puts forward a valuable point, however in the same way it's not just as easy as "luff god and let him into your life and then you'll be throwing people about with awesome TK p0w4h". Hermetics (just for example) is basically, a long and drawn out method of first purifying yourself and then allowing God into your life.

Logged

The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

MikeWho
Greenhorn
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 213
Karma: 1

Ani otseh ha-orad

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #11 on: June 13, 2007, 11:35:52 AM »

people also often times misunderstand the bible, and tend to fit it into their box of perspective, so to speak, so they can match things with what they want to believe to be true and righteous.

I agree with Steve for the most part as opposed to anyone else commenting here. Not to mention a guy/gal named CyberDemon is the one with the answers to scriptures, haha.

The Kabbalah in itself cannot grant anyone magical abilities. There is no Magic, there is only righteousness. They are called Tzadakim. These are the righteous and humble men, whom are rare in number, who can perform feets through the power of God. This is talmudic, and biblical.

Take Rabbi Akiva (akiba, however you want to pronounce it, the Bet takes on the sound of a V or a B.) The man was a convert (or his father was a convert?) and he learned hebrew with children, while he was an adult. Because of his humble heart, and his desire to know God, and know righteousness, for reasons totally outside of magic/power, is how he learned secrets that made him able to perform feets. The feets are actually feets of understanding. Of understanding God, and wisdom, and righteousness. Without this, your study of kabbalah and magic are in vain, and you will recieve nothing.

A sorcerer is one who receives magical powers because he seeks the powers. A Tzadek is one who is blessed by God, because God knows his heart.

Be Tzadek, Not Rasha.

But do not think Tzadek, think Rasha. - the talmud

(be holy, not unholy.

but be holy, because you are humble, and not try to be humble and think you are humble, that is Rasha.)

Logged

CyberDemon08

Settling In

*

Posts: 34

Karma: 0

Scientia est potestas

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatible

« Reply #12 on: June 13, 2007, 12:24:40 PM »

There is no righteousness in the souls of men; only the Original Sin. This sin, and that which we accumulate by our actions, is like a barrier between ourselves and God.

Salvation through the one called the Messiah washes away the accumulated sins we have thus far. The point is, we continue to sin because we are sinful, hence the need for artificial systems, like magic, to allow us to purify our souls and hopefully destroy the sin within us, that God may act through us better. If, to achieve the power, all we need is initial salvation, why doesn't everyone who ever prayed with Pat Robertson at the end of the 700 Club have access to the power of the Prophets? Because salvation does not grant power, it grants salvation (duh). To be a vessel for the will of God, one must have higher aspirations. One who is saved but does not use magic will ascend to heaven but is unlikely to ever see themselves blessed in the manner of those who do. Those who use magic without salvation shall not be saved, but will reap the benefits of their practice while on earth. Salvation does not make one a suitable vessel for God to indwell, nor does magic grant salvation. They are exclusive and complementary.

~Clarification~

Whatever I say here is obviously my own, possibly flawed opinions. They are not inerrant truth. A guy named CyberDemon does not have all the answers about Scriptures, nor about anything else. I did not write this article to address or fit Qabbalah, Hermetics, Judaism, the Torah, Islam, or the Church of the Flying Spaghetti Monster. It is only my own thoughts about the interactions of Christianity and the Esoteric. I do not

believe in the Bible as literal truth, Scriptural arguments make little impression on me. I am a Christian Mystic; I seek to walk w/Christ through emulation, not blind obedience. I accepted salvation by way of the prayer of redemption, and thus my salvation is guarantee. I now seek to improve myself, my life and my world. I tried waiting for God to give all kinds of fancy spiritual gifts unto me; it never happened. I have decided they must be earned, and this is my goal. Man sees faces. Skin. Flags and membership lists. God sees hearts.

Logged
Steve
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3290
Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #13 on: June 13, 2007, 04:51:59 PM »

Quote

There is no righteousness in the souls of men; only the Original Sin. This sin, and that which we accumulate by our actions, is like a barrier between ourselves and God. Salvation through the one called the Messiah washes away the accumulated sins we have thus far. The point is, we continue to sin because we are sinful, hence the need for artificial systems, like magic, to allow us to purify our souls and hopefully destroy the sin within us, that God may act through us better.

I do not believe in "original sin" beyond the bible saying Adam and Eve sinned originally. Even if it is true, forgiveness given to us by/through Christ does indeed wash away our sins, as you say. But we do not need a magical system to help us remain pure; merely a decision to become as God wishes us to be and the conviction to actually stick to that decision.

Jesus did not give a complex set of rites and rituals to perform in order to change your life; his teaching was simply "be perfect, therefore, as your Heavenly Father is perfect". He taught what godliness is so that we could learn what godliness is, and then put it into practice. It doesn't take multiple lifetimes, it takes but a single decision to follow that way of life.

Quote

If, to achieve the power, all we need is initial salvation, why doesn't everyone who ever prayed with Pat Robertson at the end of the 700 Club have access to the power of the Prophets? Because salvation does not grant power, it grants salvation (duh).

I do not know who Pat Robertson is, but you are correct in saying that "salvation" alone is not what grants the power of God, as the scriptures fully declare that God alone is who grants His power to whom He chooses.

"One who is saved but does not use magic will ascend to heaven but is unlikely to ever see themselves blessed in the manner of those who do." All such earthly blessings will pass along with the sufferings on the other side of the spectrum. Set your sights on the things above, on the things beyond the world, the things that will not rust or be destroyed; on the good things that God will give His people whom He loves and who loves Him.

"Salvation does not make one a suitable vessel for God to indwell, nor does magic grant salvation." A person does not save themselves, but is "saved" by God when they accept the promise made by Jesus and God through Jesus' teachings, death, and resurrection. So it is not salvation that makes one a "suitable vessel", but it is becoming a godly person that brings about salvation.

"I do not believe in the Bible as literal truth, Scriptural arguments make little impression on me." It is from the scriptures that we find the teachings of Christ, without which no man can truly call himself a follower of him. The only other source of knowledge about Jesus comes from the Holy Spirit of God, which would not contradict that which is already written through the Spirit of God for that would mean God contradicts Himself. And one learns knowledge from the Holy Spirit by becoming obedient and trusting what It has to say, not by making up one's own theories in one's own mind and trusting them because of human reasoning and ideologies.

"I tried waiting for God to give all kinds of fancy spiritual gifts unto me; it never happened." Did you ask while you waited? I asked for wisdom when I was younger, and God gave it to me. I am now also waiting until I also better myself before asking God for greater spiritual gifts, though I don't believe it's because I have to but instead simply because I do not want the world to see me doing good things one minute and them praising god on account "of me", and then seeing me doing something extremely foolish the next minute and cursing god on my account.

~Steve

I repeat: Let no one take me for a fool. But if you do, then receive me just as you would a fool, so that I may do a little boasting. In this self-confident boasting I am not talking as the Lord would, but as a fool. Since many are boasting in the way the world does, I too will boast. You gladly put up with fools since you are so wise! In fact, you even put up with anyone who enslaves you or exploits you or takes advantage of you or pushes himself forward or slaps you in the face. To my shame I admit that we were too weak for that!

What anyone else dares to boast about—I am speaking as a fool—I also dare to boast about. Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they Abraham's descendants? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? (I am out of my mind to talk like this.) I am more. I have worked much harder, been in prison more frequently, been flogged more severely, and been exposed to death again and again. Five times I

received from the Jews the forty lashes minus one. Three times I was beaten with rods, once I was stoned, three times I was shipwrecked, I spent a night and a day in the open sea, I have been constantly on the move. I have been in danger from rivers, in danger from bandits, in danger from my own countrymen, in danger from Gentiles; in danger in the city, in danger in the country, in danger at sea; and in danger from false brothers. I have labored and toiled and have often gone without sleep; I have known hunger and thirst and have often gone without food; I have been cold and naked. Besides everything else, I face daily the pressure of my concern for all the churches. Who is weak, and I do not feel weak? Who is led into sin, and I do not inwardly burn?

If I must boast, I will boast of the things that show my weakness. The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, who is to be praised forever, knows that I am not lying. In Damascus the governor under King Aretas had the city of the Damascenes guarded in order to arrest me. But I was lowered in a basket from a window in the wall and slipped through his hands.

I must go on boasting. Although there is nothing to be gained, I will go on to visions and revelations from the Lord. I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven. Whether it was in the body or out of the body I do not know—God knows. And I know that this man—whether in the body or apart from the body I do not know, but God knows— was caught up to paradise. He heard inexpressible things, things that man is not permitted to tell. I will boast about a man like that, but I will not boast about myself, except about my weaknesses. Even if I should choose to boast, I would not be a fool, because I would be speaking the truth. But I refrain, so no one will think more of me than is warranted by what I do or say.

To keep me from becoming conceited because of these surpassingly great revelations, there was given me a thorn in my flesh, a messenger of Satan, to torment me. Three times I pleaded with the Lord to take it away from me. But he said to me, "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness." Therefore I will boast all the more gladly about my weaknesses, so that Christ's power may rest on me. That is why, for Christ's sake, I delight in weaknesses, in insults, in hardships, in persecutions, in difficulties. For when I am weak, then I am strong.

-Paul

Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #14 on: June 13, 2007, 07:21:13 PM »

Quote

"Every year hundreds of people climb up Mt. Fiji. Many of them take different paths, but when you are standing on top of the mountain, it matters little how you got there."

Also true in this case. Christianity is a single path, and any paradigm of magic is yet another single path. To say that magic as an overall system of the will is compatible with Christianity is fallacy; different paradigms of magic have different morals and spiritual tenants. For example, Hermetics and Christianity are highly compatible, and this is one of the reasons it has often been said that Jesus could have been a Hermetic magician (because Hermetics and Christianity both emerged from Judaism and Judeo-Qabalistic mysticism, albeit they have evolved on different routes since then).

A Buddhist with the same amount of devotion will reach a equivalent place as the Christian, both hypothetically, both of their belief systems may be erroneous. God cares not for the details of your belief in Him; you may reach divinity (which is in this context, "salvation") through following systems of spirituality and attaining their "endpoint" insofar as is possible in life. The Holy Spirit is not limited to Christianity, this is why all over the world we have the same sort of phenomenon that Christ Jesus manifested happening through other people, but it is usually ignored due to the nature of modern society, especially Western society.

Saying that one does not need magic if you have God is technically true, this cannot be disagreed with.

However, you also have to look at, and subsequently define what "having God" is. Do you mean to the extent that one becomes like the "Men of God" in the Bible (the general title applied to a prophet)? If you have that sort of devotion and faith, then no, you need not strive for magic. Then again, no one ever needs to use magic. If paradigms equate to paths up the mountain, then magic is a single style of path, and mysticism is yet another. Both work well. Strong religion devotion also works. In the end, by being a spiritual mystic/magician/prophet (though a prophet would general be the "highest" of those three) then you will eventually be able to manifest anything Jesus did, but this is irrelevant. It is a side effect of having the "Breath of God" come upon the soul and unite with the Ruach.

Now, is everyone capable of this religious devotion which qualifies one for being a "man of God?" Technically, anyone can succeed at it, but does every person have the will to do this? No. Magic and mysticism are longer roads than true religion (which is the sort of devotion the early Christians, one of the original apostles or the first 120 described in Acts, possessed), but there are many "true religions." The issue is that

people think they are following them correctly when they are not. When something as small as insulting another person becomes a very real sin, then many people are not going to be able to follow the religion correctly, and indeed, most do not. Subsequently, as the population of actual followers of the religion decreases, the religious institution begins to corrupt (which we can see in the example of Catholicism. Based on the Pauline letters, the current state of the Vatican is that of a false teacher, but most do not bother with the letters, or much after the gospels...)

Looking at the above, we may also see what Max Heindel meant when he first said, "Occultism points the way to Christ when faith alone cannot find Him."

Most people are not capable of the faith which can move mountains. For this reason we have slower, but nevertheless just as effective styles of spirituality such as spiritual magic and mysticism (such as Hermetics, Christian mysticism, Qabalah, Ogdoadic Magic, Rosicrucianism, though the latter two or somewhat related to Hermetics).

Thus different styles of "pavement" exist on each road up the mountain to God. But each one, whether coarse or smooth, winding or straight, long or short, high or low, leads to the same summit. There every person breathes of the same refreshing air and seeing the glorifying light of the same Sun above them and around them.

Namaste

Logged

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 8 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C10604.15.html>

1 capture

07 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 12:06:41 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

166543 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ Discussion Areas

| | -+ Magick

| | | -+ Christianity and Magick are Compatable 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 8 Print

Author Topic: Christianity and Magick are Compatable (Read 6534 times)

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

View Profile

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #15 on: June 13, 2007, 11:20:22 PM »

"Christianity is a single path, and any paradigm of magic is yet another single path. "

Well, if magic is a different path than christianity, why does hermeticism feel the need to try and adapt so much of christianity into their own theology? we blast the catholics and other later denominations of christianity for doing the same thing.

~Steve

Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Veos

Veritas Moderator

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 466

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #16 on: June 14, 2007, 12:18:42 AM »

Concerning the nature of Magick and Religion, I feel compelled to quote Dr. Charles Wentworth Littlefield (1859-1945). In a letter to Dr. H. Spencer Lewis he wrote:

"A Magus cannot be ignorant, for he needs only to ask and knowledge is given him. While he leans on religion, he is not weighed down thereby. He is never in want, for the plentitude of nature supplies his every need. He welcomes pleasure, accepts wealth, deserves honor, but is never slave to any of them. He knows how to be poor; how to abstain; how to suffer, and he endures oblivion willingly because he is lord of his own happiness and expects and fears nothing. The true disciple can love without being beloved; he can create imperishable treasure and exalt himself above the level of the delights that worldly honors bestow. He possesses that which he seeks. He regrets nothing that must end, but remembers with satisfaction that he has met only good in it all."

As Franz Bardon says, the True Magician follows the religion of Universal Law, and realizes that any religion embodies that law to some extent or another, according to the degree of spiritual maturity that its founder and followers possess. At the current time, there are two religions that embody more Universal Laws and truths than anyother, and those are Christianity and Hinduism. Christ is the embodiment of the Word, and thus his religion in its purest form follows the teachings of Universal Law very closely in both an esoteric and exoteric manner, while Hinduism embodies the Universal Laws of Mysticism and self evolution as taught by their illumined Sages. Religion is beautiful when it opens doors for us...but it's when it closes doors that it becomes hideous. People approach God differently depending on their own spiritual maturity and what is acceptable unto them. However, he who says that "Christianity is right and all other religion is wrong" has clearly never spent time with a Yogi Master. He who says "Yoga is the only light given unto us from Siva" has clearly never been in the presence of a Christian Saint. However, what is always important is Experience, as it is the gateway to Wisdom. As such, to come to a conclusion about something before experiencing it is to be a hypocrite.

Digressing back to the usual "GOd gives all things to those who worship and follow him" scenario, as I have previously said, this is an inherently mystic remark. Yes, a christian could religiously follow the teachings of Christ and hope for a glimpse of some power, which sould not be their Goal. The Holy Spirit is divine, and if it enters into you, then you share in its divinity. If such a high state can be achieved with religion, then why practice magick!? Why is it never the other way around; If such a thing can be achieved with magick, why practice religion!? It is a matter of personal approach. If you should seek such an exalted state by means of religion, then by all means go ahead, as it is completely possible! Many such religious people are capable of many things, and are truly inspiring people. A Good friend of mine is such a christian who has undoubtedly been filled by the Holy Spirit, and is extremely well known is Deliverance Ministry, having appeared on television a number of times and witting

several books. He is a walking testimony to the power of such an achievement. However, while he acknowledges the spiritual worlds and its inhabitants, he keeps all focus on God and worries little about the universe around him. We have been in many long arguments about this, because while he says it as an honor to God, I see it as a slap in a face to him! The magician then is the investigator, the Scientist of the Universe. We would not be so happy if we built a beautiful house for a loved one, and upon showing it to them they went straight inside and went to sleep, having never acknowledged the beauty of the House, and the skill needed to build it! Rather, we should feel much better if the loved one came in and examined the walls, the tapestry, the carpentry used to create it, so that they could appreciate the creation. If God has created us a House made of diamonds and the most beautiful stones, should we then only concern ourselves with the parts of this grand House that we need to eat, sleep, and keep shelter in? Why not explore all of its hallways and hidden rooms? Would it not make us adore the creator of this grand House even more!? Thus is the magician.

And Steve, as much as I love your posts, I must bring a quote here:
Quote from: Steve on June 13, 2007, 10:09:37 AM

Do not be deceived by the qabalists who claim the Holy Spirit is part of their tradition; what the apostles say, and record Jesus as saying, is vastly different from what the qabalists claim regarding how one receives the Holy Spirit. Jesus and the apostles, and the Torah as well for those who are disinterested in the NT but are still interested in the OT, say it is a gift from God given to those whom God chooses, but the qabalists say it is something within you that you achieve by devotion to magical practices.

You clearly do not understand the Kabballah, so please refrain from denoting Kabbalists as "deceivers", as we should not judge those whom we don't know.

« Last Edit: June 14, 2007, 12:45:47 AM by Veos » Logged

Soham Sivoham Aham Brahma Asmi Mahavakya

Suddha satchitananda purna parabrahma

Chidananda Rupa Sivoham Sivoham

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #17 on: June 14, 2007, 12:28:38 AM »

Quote from: Steve on June 13, 2007, 10:09:37 AM

My point is less "magic should not be done" so much as it is "why bother if God Himself will give you power?"

Why do anything at all if God is capable of doing everything for us?

There are two reasons I see:

1. He clearly doesn't do everything for us, which should be a huge hint about his goals.
2. We grow by doing things and learning from the resulting experiences.

Logged

Zohar

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 111

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #18 on: June 14, 2007, 03:35:50 AM »

Steve, your theory about magick not being necessary due to believing in Jesus is a total embodiment of the steriotypical "Grocery-Shopping Christian" attitude that many of us who become involved in the occult have been trying to get away from. By "grocery shopping Christian", I mean picking and choosing what commandments laid out in the Bible you want to follow and also choosing when to interact with Him according to when it seems most convinient, because you believe that your belief in Jesus as the saviour will guaruntee a place for you in heaven, no matter what. At this point I'm going to assume your a christian, only because you seem to know quite a bit about it and are arguing about the topic. So it is, then, most likely that you know what I'm speaking of when I speak of the outreach programs that so many Christians and Churches are involved in. By your logic, outreach isn't needed... Because, according to your transe of thought, God created the universe and can do what he pleases with it... So, since he can help these people by himself without any aid from you and can fully choose if those people are worth saving or not, we **SHOULDN'T BE HELPING THEM AT ALL**. But the truth is, it is something many Churches do because it helps us grow in our faith and relationship with the Creator. True occultism isn't just petty spell casting to fulfill your own will, it is searching for a deeper knowledge of the unknown and trying to interact with a chosen God-head and experience Him on a more personal level.

There's most likely a comment coming about how all the knowledge we need has been given to us by God himself in the Bible. However, the Bible is not God's exact word.

These are the prophets' interpretations of his word and more often than not, contain many metaphors that shouldn't be, but often are, taken straight up and without the least bit of contemplation. Even if the Bible was the final and exact word of God, there is no specific path laid out that one MUST follow, hence so many denominations of the Christian faith. Our 'spells' are just stepping stones that help the magician grow in his faith and walk with the Lord, much like outreach and community service. A true christian knows that he must constantly challenge and reassess what he believes, in order to further grow and further understand the wonders of the Creator. For many of us, this is a better way of spiritual growth because we found it to be much more inspiring and motivating than attending Church once every 3 weeks and calling ourselves saints. Lastly, after seeing you rehash this argument a thousand times in the Chat, you're most likely going to comment on how we can spiritually grow and interact with God through prayer, and therefore our incantations aren't necessary. Well, incantations are called prayers in many different systems and paradigms of magick, and rightly so. Their general construction and manner of being administered bears much resemblance to a traditional prayer, and are often times directed at lower entities, like how the Catholics pray to the saints. The only main difference is often times our incantations work in a much more direct manner.

Now then, I appologize for writing this in such a horrible manner. But it's 4:35 AM, I'm dirt tired, and kinda threw this together in a manner of 2 minutes. What I'm really trying to get at Steve, is that just because you are satisfied with your relationship with God and the way you go about having that relationship, doesn't mean the magicians way of interacting and growing with Him are wrong. But, I also respect how you choose to have your relationship with God, because there is more than one path, and the belief of Jesus Christ being the son of God brings both the orthodoxy Christians and the esoteric Christians together. I just hear this argument so often from my fundamentalist Christian friends, family, and pastor that it really gets on my nerves. Your argument has, and always will have, many valid points. However, I only hope you can grow to grasp that magick is much more than just attaining your will to the experienced occultist. To many, it is a genuine attempt to interact with the divine.

Logged

G-d created the world in the image of the world above; all which is found above has its analogy below... and everything constitutes a unity.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #19 on: June 14, 2007, 06:56:17 AM »

Quote from: Steven

"Christianity is a single path, and any paradigm of magic is yet another single path. " Well, if magic is a different path than christianity, why does hermeticism feel the need to try and adapt so much of christianity into their own theology? we blast the catholics and other later denominations of christianity for doing the same thing.

1. Read what I typed out again. Magic is a style of spiritual ascension, religion is another.
2. Hermetics is not simply a magical system, it naturally involves spiritual understanding. And it's not "stealing" anything from Christianity; Hermetics existed beforehand in any case in Egypt around the same time the Hebrews were there dating back to the times of Exodus.
3. "We" don't blast the Catholics; people who do so obviously are generalizing what is supposed to be a good method of spirituality (but has technically not stayed faithful to Biblibal teachings as an institution in this day and age).

Quote from: Zohar

Steve, your theory about magick not being necessary due to believing in Jesus is a total embodiment of the steriotypical "Grocery-Shopping Christian" attitude that many of us who become involved in the occult have been trying to get away from.

You've obviously never been in the presence of a Christian saint, or at least reseached a few, have you?

Does anyone recall how St. Francis of Asissi levitated? This is a good example of how high religious devotion eventually achieved the same state as any magician, and any mystic. Belief is just as powerful as magic, and will indeed move mountains when strong enough. Let's look at this through the perspective of an enlightened Franciscan monk: Why use magic if 1. I live a humble life wherein I need not have much for myself, and 2. I can use prayer and the Holy Spirit to help other people metaphysically just as well as any magician?

I have to argue this in favor of Steven. He brings to the table a valid point; if one is truly religious, then there is no need for magic. But then again, there never is, and magic is only one type of path. Any magician who looks at a Christian saint and does not at least respect his high devotion and dedication towards God is obviously missing something; no path is any superior to any other, but some or more effective than others, and this also depends upon cirumstance, environment, and most importantly, the individual.

Magic, mysticism, true religion, etc. The roads end in the same place.No single one is any better than the other, but one may be better for an individual person.

"Occultism points the way to Christ when faith alone cannot find him."

The quote by Max Heindel shows a relationship between all paths. Occultism is a slower path than religious devotion, and much more suited to Western people (think about it, practicing occultism even for 5 hours a day is considered very high, but a religious monk will pray for entire days at a time. Who shall reach the end first?) Occultism is also a very good path for people who aren't suited to absolute devotion which is supposed to be present in true religion. Of course, the average person has no spiritual path, or a very small one. Mysticism is usually longer than occultism and religion, but it still yields the same result as the former two. None are superior. They have different advantages and disadvantages, and have different focuses and approaches (such as occultism with analyzing the outside universe; mysticism with the microcosm, or inside universe of the self, etc...)

Quote from: Zohar

There's most likely a comment coming about how all the knowledge we need has been given to us by God himself in the Bible. However, the Bible is not God's exact word. These are the prophets' interpretations of his word and more often than not, contain many metaphors that shouldn't be, but often are, taken straight up and without the least bit of contemplation.

This is true in some cases but not in others. For example, we can reasonably assume that the letters of the New Testament are biased and contain ideas which are simply beliefs.

However, in some cases, such as the Torah, the human who wrote it cannot claim authorship because it was not as if God gave him ideas to translate into words; it was a form of automatic writing, in which straight words were used either from an angel or God. Either way, no human wrote it, and it is still the straight word of God. There are various levels of this, such as simply being inspired to write something to the point that an intelligent angel is actually controlling your arm, hand, and fingers and writing for you. In automatic writing, the human is not the author, and does not embed his own opinions or beliefs into the work.

Quote from: Zohar

hence so many denominations of the Christian faith.

The grand majority are false teaching denominations. This is quite obvious; would you prefer to follow an original set, such as Catholicism (though again, no denomination present is of the same holy quality it was when it first was started...), which has the most cases of people attaining enlightenment, or would you like to follow some individual who founded just another denomination and never even proved his worth, by giving teachings of Jesus' caliber or manifesting "signs" as Christ Jesus did. Follow the leader who can benefit you most, and if possible, follow him as directly as possible, instead of depending on a religion which has no parallel leader to Jesus to speak of (in this context I am speaking of Christian denominations).

Quote from: Zhoar

Lastly, after seeing you rehash this argument a thousand times in the Chat, you're most likely going to comment on how we can spiritually grow and interact with God through prayer, and therefore our incantations aren't necessary.

"Do not think of tomorrow; let tomorrow handle itself. There is evil enough in one day."

It is a logical fallacy to try and predict what the opponent in an argument will argue next in order to try and "shut down" their point in the future. I know; I've tried it. I politely suggest you not do this; it doesn't help and the future argument is irrelevant to the present one, it doesn't exist.

Lastly, one should remember that even a wrong belief, when properly followed in a true religious manner and with the same devotion as a correct belief, will yield the same attainment and power and the correct belief (usually).

This is why believing in Christ Jesus as the only begotten son of God will prove very fruitful to your spiritual attainment regardless of whether or not it is true. Is it true? This is irrelevant to the matter at hand, and you may think about it if you wish, but either way you obtain the same result. Jesus Christ died, he no longer exists as a live human being (most likely) and regardless of him being truly the Son of God or not, believing this to be so and thus acting and living truly in the way he did and suggested will bring you the same enlightenment he purportedly possessed.

Namaste
Logged
MikeWho
Greenhorn
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 206

apathetically inclined.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #20 on: June 14, 2007, 11:56:24 AM »

Quote

This is why believing in Christ Jesus as the only begotten son of God will prove very fruitful to your spiritual attainment regardless of whether or not it is true. Is it true? This is irrelevant to the matter at hand, and you may think about it if you wish, but either way you obtain the same result. Jesus Christ died, he no longer exists as a live human

being (most likely) and regardless of him being truly the Son of God or not, believing this to be so and thus acting and living truly in the way he did and suggested will bring you the same enlightenment he purportedly possessed.

I like this Abramelanish statement. Whether or not I fully agree is a different question. I believe that enough faith of anything will acquire powers to the individual. However I think that me and you would differ as to where those powers are from.

I want to quickly comment on Zohar's comment on "those seeking occultism as a means to escape the grocery store christian.....etc etc etc"

I think that if anyone is seeking the occult as a different means of spiritual elevation, before that elevation has even taken place (and who am I to admit myself or any of us have reached such an elevation), or for answers, will find only lies. They will find more confusion, and in the long run, damage their soul. For this point, I will be very fixed and say this is true, and there is no argument against this, because if there is, you are wrong. Let's be honest here, the occult is about the science. Somewhere along the lines, scientific theories, turned into "supposed-truths" that we are now teaching/ being taught. Through theory was gnosticism formed, you can see this through its outline alone. Pieces of beliefs puzzled together so to speak, to make sense. Then you have New Age beliefs. I don't even believe New Age to be occultic, as much as hypnosis and brainwashing. Take Wicca for example, a cult for the individual, the enemy of High Magic. A wiccan however would argue this, but they don't know any better, so their ignorance is tolerated.

Magic was initially taught as wisdom, to disciples, and men thirsty for understanding started seeking. Magic was what? Art of the Magi. (Of course systems of witchcraft can be found throughout history, yet with pagan doctrine, like that of the Chaldeans.)

To summarise this very confusing, with tree branches stemming off of it, belief of my own, before I lose too much sense:

The main problem that we pinpoint upon is the individual(s) that may belong to one of these religions, rather than the belief itself. A High Magician knows through proof that there is only one truth and one God. The occult is a personal science, so there is self revelation.

So rather than point point point your fingers, and say we are escaping this, because of that, and that because of this, bend your elbow directly back, and put your fingers in your eyes, and pull out that plank of wood,

because my plank is bigger than your splinter, and your splinter is as big as my plank.

I'm reading through this realizing this is very riddle'ish.

Logged
Zohar

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 111

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #21 on: June 14, 2007, 04:07:38 PM »

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 06:56:17 AM

Quote from: Zohar

Steve, your theory about magick not being necessary due to believing in Jesus is a total embodiment of the stereotypical "Grocery-Shopping Christian" attitude that many of us who become involved in the occult have been trying to get away from.

You've obviously never been in the presence of a Christian saint, or at least researched a few, have you?

Does anyone recall how St. Francis of Asissi levitated? This is a good example of how high religious devotion eventually achieved the same state as any magician, and any mystic. Belief is just as powerful as magic, and will indeed move mountains when strong enough. Let's look at this through the perspective of an enlightened Franciscan monk: Why use magic if 1. I live a humble life wherein I need not have much for myself, and 2. I can use prayer and the Holy Spirit to help other people metaphysically just as well as any magician?

I have to argue this in favor of Steven. He brings to the table a valid point; if one is truly religious, then there is no need for magic. But then again, there never is, and magic is only one type of path. Any magician who looks at a Christian saint and does not at least respect his high devotion and dedication towards God is obviously missing something; no path is any superior to any other, but some or more effective than others, and this also depends upon circumstance, environment, and most importantly, the individual.

Magic, mysticism, true religion, etc. The roads end in the same place. No single one is any better than the other, but one may be better for an individual person.

Can you read? I explained grocery shopping Christianity to be picking and choosing what rules you want to follow and when you want to walk closer with God/Jesus/Buddha/whatever in accordance with how convenient it is for you at the time. Nowhere in what I wrote, did I ever say ANYTHING about faith not being important. The above statements were meant to explain how telling us that striving for divine interaction, (even if by our own means), is not needed because Jesus is the way to God and following the path of the righteous Christian only when you deem it convinient because your belief in Jesus links you to heaven, (no matter what), are much alike in

their own respects.

Also, your saint psycho-babble-bullshit is just meant to throw facts in the faces of the more easily swayed. I do agree with the statement that high religious devotion can attain the same state as any magician, and any mystic. But by that logic alone, it can be reversed to say that high magick devotion can also achieve the same state as high religious devotion. That was what my whole post was about. It was meant to state that magick is another way for many people to personally experience a chosen God-head... It wasn't stating that faith isn't at all important in a relationship with the Creator.

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 06:56:17 AM

Quote from: Zhoar

Lastly, after seeing you rehash this argument a thousand times in the Chat, you're most likely going to comment on how we can spiritually grow and interact with God through prayer, and therefore our incantations aren't necessary.

"Do not think of tomorrow; let tomorrow handle itself. There is evil enough in one day."

It is a logical fallacy to try and predict what the opponent in an argument will argue next in order to try and "shut down" their point in the future. I know; I've tried it. I politely suggest you not do this; it doesn't help and the future argument is irrelevant to the present one, it doesn't exist.

I was using this rhetorical argument of Steve's to make a valid point which pertained to the rest of my post. Also, to say that it is a logical fallacy to try and predict what he was going to say is your own theory. I based this prediction off of many past arguments I have seen Steve partake in, and also because I have yet to ever see him try and change this particular argument in the least. And to your suggestion that this is discontinued in the future, if there are no past circumstances to back up such a statement, I would not and will not use such a notion to bring up a valid point in an argument. But, it was, and still is, one of his arguments with a strong point to it, and so I felt it RELEVANT to bring up a point on it as it was RELEVANT to my post. It was a RELEVANT statement because the argument that followed after that prediction was in correspondence to the rest of what I had written. I am going to politely ask you to consider the fact that just because a statement is a counter to a predicted argument doesn't make it IRRELEVANT.

Lastly, since everyone else feels that every single quote out there is absolute truth, I will leave you all with this one:

The magician becomes filled with God, fed upon God, intoxicated with God. Little by little his body will become purified by the internal lustration of God; day by day his mortal frame, shedding its earthly elements, will become in very truth the Temple of the Holy Ghost. Day by day matter is replaced by Spirit, the human by the divine, ultimately the change will be complete; God manifest in flesh will be his name.

-Aleister Crowley

Logged

G-d created the world in the image of the world above; all which is found above has its analogy below... and everything constitutes a unity.

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #22 on: June 14, 2007, 05:12:24 PM »

[EDIT] And to clarify my statement about kabalic deceivers, I could have written that better.

Do not be deceived by the kabalists who claim that the Holy Spirit is something that can be reached through one's own power or ability (ie, not all kabalists). The Holy Spirit of God is not something achieved or attained, it is something given or obtained. This is written in the Torah, the Talmud, and the christian writings. The only place that differs is kabalists who say that it is possible to attain the Holy Spirit of God through their own power and workings.

[/EDIT]

Veos: Once again, I don't care about magic in this regard. Why bother with something extraneous when you can simply accept a gift from God? Or did you not know that noone is justified before God? It is only faith in God that justifies a man, not his own greatness.

Romans 3: 21But now a righteousness from God, apart from law, has been made known, to which the Law and the Prophets testify. 22This righteousness from God comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe. There is no difference, 23for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, 24and are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus. 25God presented him as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his justice, because in his forbearance he had left the sins committed beforehand unpunished— 26he did it to demonstrate his justice at the present time, so as to be just and the one who justifies those who have faith in Jesus.

Kobok:

Quote

Why do anything at all if God is capable of doing everything for us?

There are two reasons I see:

1. He clearly doesn't do everything for us, which should be a huge hint about his goals.
 2. We grow by doing things and learning from the resulting experiences.
- Why do anything? Because we love God and *desire* to do what He wants us to. Can

God Himself not tell the whole world about Himself? Yes. So why does He require His people to teach it to the world? To give us something to do, as well as give us challenges whereby we can *show* our love and devotion to Him by doing His will even if the whole world is against us rather than just giving Him empty words of "I love you".

1. He will do many things for you, according to the bible. These are given as promises.

Mark 13:11 "Whenever you are arrested and brought to trial, do not worry beforehand about what to say. Just say whatever is given you at the time, for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit."

John 14: 11Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me; or at least believe on the evidence of the miracles themselves. 12I tell you the truth, anyone who has faith in me will do what I have been doing. He will do even greater things than these, because I am going to the Father. 13And I will do whatever you ask in my name, so that the Son may bring glory to the Father. 14You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it.

John 16: 21A woman giving birth to a child has pain because her time has come; but when her baby is born she forgets the anguish because of her joy that a child is born into the world. 22So with you: Now is your time of grief, but I will see you again and you will rejoice, and no one will take away your joy. 23In that day you will no longer ask me anything. I tell you the truth, my Father will give you whatever you ask in my name. 24Until now you have not asked for anything in my name. Ask and you will receive, and your joy will be complete.

Matthew 6: 28"And why do you worry about clothes? See how the lilies of the field grow. They do not labor or spin. 29Yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all his splendor was dressed like one of these. 30If that is how God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith? 31So do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?' 32For the pagans run after all these things, and your heavenly Father knows that you need them. 33But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.

So why doesn't He? Probably because most don't ask. Or, to put it better:

James 4:1What causes fights and quarrels among you? Don't they come from your desires that battle within you? 2You want something but don't get it. You kill and covet, but you cannot have what you want. You quarrel and fight. You do not have, because you do not ask God. 3When you ask, you do not receive, because you ask with wrong motives, that you may spend what you get on your pleasures.

4You adulterous people, don't you know that friendship with the world is hatred toward God? Anyone who chooses to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God. 5Or do you think Scripture says without reason that the spirit he caused to live in us envies intensely?[a] 6But he gives us more grace. That is why Scripture says:

"God opposes the proud
but gives grace to the humble."(b)

7Submit yourselves, then, to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.
8Come near to God and he will come near to you. Wash your hands, you sinners, and purify your hearts, you double-minded. 9Grieve, mourn and wail. Change your laughter to mourning and your joy to gloom. 10Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will lift you up.

He is the one who gave us life. He is the one who gave us food in the garden. He is the one who gave us everything we needed in the beginning. He took care of us then so why do you say it is so bad for Him to take care of us now? Why do you say "we need to go it alone" when God says "come to me, all you who are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest"?

2. There are plenty enough experiences and wonders in the world, but more important than them is God. Grow towards God, not towards the world for the world is only created, like us, whereas God is the Creator.

Kobok: Why is it that God says "trust in Me" yet you say "trust in reason"? God is greater than reason; even if reason is man's greatest attribute it pales in comparison to the majesty and truth of God.

Zohar: If you're accusing me of being eclectic in my walk with God, then you are partially right but only because I am not strong enough to follow all of God's laws yet (so thank the Lord that He is a forgiving God!). However, I do not advocate or believe in the idea of picking and choosing which laws are valid based on what I feel like wanting to follow. I study the word and will of God to *know* which of God's Laws given in the bible God wishes I follow, and when in doubt I ask Him directly and wait for an answer (for instance, God commanded that the Jews not eat pig meat. Through study I know that I need not follow that law because I am not a Jew and because of the revelation from God given to Peter. On the other hand, I know that I am forbidden from committing adultery because God abhors it fiercely and there is no exception to this law for anyone).

"because you believe that your belief in Jesus as the saviour will guarantee a place for you in heaven, no matter what." It is only faith in Jesus that can give us forgiveness from God through Christianity, so if I trust in Jesus and God forgives me then thankful am I that the Lord will allow me into His presence. This belief is not a personal desire, nor one born out of philosophy, but a promise from Jesus and that is why I can trust in it though I do trust in it because God has given me direct reasons and knowledge regarding it.

"By your logic, outreach isn't needed". You are correct in saying these words. God can teach the world about Himself directly, and has done so in the past and will likely do so also in the future. But Jesus has commanded that we go out and teach the knowledge of the Lord to the rest of the world, so both because of obedience to God and because of love for God I will do follow this command.

"we SHOULDN'T BE HELPING THEM AT ALL." This you are not correct in saying. We are not needed because how is it possible that a God who created more than we even know to exist could possibly need our help? That's ridiculous. Yet God wants us to do these things, for the reasons God has (and which you would know if you read the bible, for they are written there).

"There's most likely a comment coming about how all the knowledge we need has been given to us by God himself in the Bible." Even if it's not, God through Jesus has given us a promise that He will give His Holy Spirit to His people, all who trust in Him and devote themselves to Him, and His Holy Spirit can teach anything and everything that may or may not be included in the bible.

1Corinthians 2: 6We do, however, speak a message of wisdom among the mature, but not the wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are coming to nothing. 7No, we speak of God's secret wisdom, a wisdom that has been hidden and that God destined for our glory before time began. 8None of the rulers of this age understood it, for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. 9However, as it is written:

"No eye has seen,
no ear has heard,
no mind has conceived
what God has prepared for those who love him"(b)— 10but God has revealed it to us by his Spirit.

The Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God. 11For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the man's spirit within him? In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. 12We have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit who is from God, that we may understand what God has freely given us.

"Even if the Bible was the final and exact word of God, there is no specific path laid out that one MUST follow" Doing the will of God, being subserviant to our Creator who created us to be servants, is the exact path laid out. There is no magical or ritualistic path, though there are many regulations or teachings that become "paths" and "rituals" to many christians who simply go through the motions without understanding what they are doing.

Micah 6:8

He has showed you, O man, what is good.
And what does the LORD require of you?
To act justly and to love mercy
and to walk humbly with your God.

Regarding prayer and incantations, I respond only with this "For the eyes of the Lord are on the righteous and his ears are attentive to their prayer, but the face of the Lord is against those who do evil." 1 Peter 3:12

Oriens: "Hermetics existed beforehand in any case in Egypt around the same time the Hebrews were there dating back to the times of Exodus." No, I'm afraid it didn't. Hermes Trismegistus didn't exist until at the earliest the 9th century BCE, since that's when the Roman civilization began. The dating of the Exodus on the other hand is listed at the latest 1200 BCE. That Hermes eventually became associated with Thoth was a much later thing indeed, and even the exact original dating of the emerald tablet (the earliest actual copy is either from 600s or 800 CE/AD) for which Hermes is accredited is unknown. This is why I put so much emphasis on learning history of theology (eventhough I hated history in school).

"However, in some cases, such as the Torah, the human who wrote it cannot claim authorship because it was not as if God gave him ideas to translate into words; it was a form of automatic writing, in which straight words were used either from an angel or God. Either way, no human wrote it, and it is still the straight word of God." No. Many people believe that the bible is the "exact word of God written by God Himself". These many people are wrong.

"Lastly, one should remember that even a wrong belief, when properly followed in a true religious manner and with the same devotion as a correct belief, will yield the same attainment and power and the correct belief (usually)." I'm going to quote something not necessarily as a means of contradiction, but simply because it's on the same issue, from Acts 9:

1Meanwhile, Saul was still breathing out murderous threats against the Lord's disciples. He went to the high priest 2and asked him for letters to the synagogues in Damascus, so that if he found any there who belonged to the Way, whether men or women, he might take them as prisoners to Jerusalem. 3As he neared Damascus on his journey, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. 4He fell to the ground and heard a voice say to him, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?"

5"Who are you, Lord?" Saul asked.

"I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting," he replied. 6"Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do."

"Is it true? This is irrelevant to the matter at hand" Actually, it does matter. If it is wrong, then the entirety of Christianity is false, as some believe, for Christianity is founded on the idea that God proved Jesus is His son by raising him from the dead as proof that there is something beyond death that we humans can look forward to. It is also our trust in Jesus' teachings and his authority as the son of God that is at stake in the question of whether Jesus truly is the son of God or not.

If anyone wants to get into the "magic is becoming something beautiful in the eyes of God" arguments, then I will not argue because I see christianity as being the same way, and I see this as being the proper way of coming to God in love and humility (that is, the state of being humble, not something to do with being mocked). It is those arguments that portray magic for the sake of it's power and self-centeredness, and that christians should be like that as well, that I will argue against, for the bible clearly teaches against this.

~Steve

Now for some time a man named Simon had practiced sorcery in the city and amazed all the people of Samaria. He boasted that he was someone great, and all the people, both high and low, gave him their attention and exclaimed, "This man is the divine power known as the Great Power." They followed him because he had amazed them for a long time with his magic. But when they believed Philip as he preached the good news of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. Simon himself believed and was baptized. And he followed Philip everywhere, astonished by the great signs and miracles he saw.

When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them. When they arrived, they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon any of them; they had simply been baptized into[c] the name of the Lord Jesus. Then Peter and John placed their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.

When Simon saw that the Spirit was given at the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money and said, "Give me also this ability so that everyone on whom I lay my hands may receive the Holy Spirit."

Peter answered: "May your money perish with you, because you thought you could buy the gift of God with money! You have no part or share in this ministry, because your heart is not right before God. Repent of this wickedness and pray to the Lord. Perhaps he will forgive you for having such a thought in your heart. For I see that you are full of bitterness and captive to sin."

Then Simon answered, "Pray to the Lord for me so that nothing you have said may happen to me."

[EDIT]

You foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you? Before your very eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed as crucified. I would like to learn just one thing from you: Did you receive the Spirit by observing the law, or by believing what you heard? Are you so foolish? After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to attain your goal by human effort? Have you suffered so much for nothing—if it really was for nothing? Does God

give you his Spirit and work miracles among you because you observe the law, or because you believe what you heard?

<http://bibleresources.bible.com/passagesearchresults.php?passage1=Galatians+3&version=31>

[/EDIT]

« Last Edit: June 14, 2007, 05:35:46 PM by Steve » Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

View Profile

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #23 on: June 14, 2007, 05:26:43 PM »

You seem somewhat offended, Zohar. Is there a problem? You give the impression of yelling. You also misunderstood in many places...

Quote from: Zohar

Can you read?

Yes, yes I can.

Quote from: Zohar

I explained grocery shopping Christianity to be picking and choosing what rules you want to follow and when you want to walk closer with God/Jesus/Buddha/whatever in accordance with how convenient it is for you at the time. Nowhere in what I wrote, did I ever say ANYTHING about faith not being important. The above statements were meant to explain how telling us that striving for divine interaction, (even if by our own means), is not needed because Jesus is the way to God and following the path of the righteous Christian only when you deem it convenient because your belief in Jesus links you to heaven, (no matter what), are much alike in their own respects.

And I explained how faith was important, regardless of you ever saying anything about faith. After the first paragraph, here I wasn't even arguing with you.

Quote from: Zohar

Also, to say that it is a logical fallacy to try and predict what he was going to say is your own theory.

No it isn't; it's elementary logic in of itself. Logic does not dictate the future, it only dictates the present. No matter what you may "deduce" from observing Steve argue,

he may choose a completely different approach in the future. Thus, trying to predict the argument will not work; and it doesn't help your argument, because as soon as you try to predict something like that aloud, the opponent, if intelligent, will do everything possible to not take the predicted approach, thus making your subsequent arguments weaker. As I said, elementary logic.

Secondly, in that paragraph you bolded and capitalized words. Please try to avoid this; it is reminiscent of an individual yelling, which is also detrimental to a proper argument.

Quote from: Zohar

Lastly, since everyone else feels that every single quote out there is absolute truth, I will leave you all with this one

1. This is a large generalization, and at that, it is completely unnecessary. In fact, it is much more reasonable to assume that most people don't think every quote is absolute truth. Generalizations are also logical fallacies.
2. This seems to be an expression of frustration. Sorry if you were offended by something, but no need to make a dramatic statement which is quite obviously wrong.
3. That quote is only attributed to Aleister Crowley because he is the author of the book in regards to G.H. Frater. G.H. Frater is the actual author of the quote.

Quote

Also, your saint psycho-babble-bullshit is just meant to throw facts in the faces of the more easily swayed.

1. Please do not be so vulgar and offensive. It serves no purpose and it counter-conductive to a good argument. If you were debating on a forensics team, you wouldn't suddenly use a word like "bullshit" in front of a panel of judges, would you?
2. You misunderstood the point of me saying that entirely if you believe I only said that to "throw facts in the faces of the more easily swayed."

Namaste

EDIT:

Quote from: Steve

Mark 13:11 "Whenever you are arrested and brought to trial, do not worry beforehand about what to say. Just say whatever is given you at the time, for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit."

John 14: 11Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me; or at least believe on the evidence of the miracles themselves. 12I tell you the truth, anyone who has faith in me will do what I have been doing. He will do even greater things than

these, because I am going to the Father. 13And I will do whatever you ask in my name, so that the Son may bring glory to the Father. 14You may ask me for anything in my name, and I will do it.

John 16: 21A woman giving birth to a child has pain because her time has come; but when her baby is born she forgets the anguish because of her joy that a child is born into the world. 22So with you: Now is your time of grief, but I will see you again and you will rejoice, and no one will take away your joy. 23In that day you will no longer ask me anything. I tell you the truth, my Father will give you whatever you ask in my name. 24Until now you have not asked for anything in my name. Ask and you will receive, and your joy will be complete.

Matthew 6: 28"And why do you worry about clothes? See how the lilies of the field grow. They do not labor or spin. 29Yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all his splendor was dressed like one of these. 30If that is how God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith? 31So do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?' 32For the pagans run after all these things, and your heavenly Father knows that you need them. 33But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.

You're using the Bible as what is implied as evidence in a debate where not everyone accepts it as the word of God. In order to argue for or against something, you must first find an agreeable definition for it. The Bible in this case does not have one of those; i.e. some believe it to be truth, others fiction. Besides, those parts of the Bible may have indeed been inspired by the Holy Spirit, but they are still biased according to the opinion of the author. This is why we see inherent differences in each gospel; using them for an argument will usually not work.

« Last Edit: June 14, 2007, 05:32:31 PM by Oriens LvX Lucis » Logged

Veos

Veritas Moderator

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 466

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #24 on: June 14, 2007, 06:15:42 PM »

Steve, I believe you are assuming we attach the same importance to the Bible as you do. As far as just asking God for everything, it seems like the easy way out. I realise that you have much more experience in Christianity than you do with magick, so unfortunately you don't understand what a gift from God magick really is. The fact that

a human being is capable of healing people at any distance, at communicating mentally, at exploring the spiritual realms, at seeing directly into those realms, at communing with nature, levitation, telekinesis, speaking with animals, and the fact that any high Adept can perform any of the miracles Christ did and explain their mechanics as well. To think that Christ didn't receive any spiritual training is ridiculous, as he would have known full well that the physical body can only withstand a certain amount of Astral Light, hence the fact that he had to transfigure on the mountain to speak with Elijah and Moses. You keep speaking about "gifts from God" when Magick itself is a gift from God. How could it not be? You could say "well look at what evil it can be used for!" Look at all the Evil Christianity has wrought upon the world!! More people have been killed in the name of God than for any other cause! I realize that you believe you are fighting for God, and your command of the Bible is excellent from a biased Christian Viewpoint, but it is sad that you can't lay down your one-sided beliefs and actually examine the Bible as a truly magnificent piece of Work that has multiple layers of meaning, instead of taking it for face value. Surely Christ understood the meaning of Secrets. We see this all over Scripture. People say "Christ taught against keeping secrets!" Oh really? Why then does he pull his disciples away from the crowd after giving his parables, and then explains them only to his disciples, while saying that he must tell them in secret or else the crowd may convert! God forbid that the crowd convert to Christianity. Why could he not teach those things openly. "Cast not your pearls before Swine!" is perhaps the most wellknown teachings of his concernign Secrecy. What it comes down to is that there is a difference between trying to be helpfull and being downright ignorant. You can quote the Bible at us as much as you care to, but the fact is that there are other means of developement. IT is a fact. If you disagree, then tell that to Sivananda's disciples in the East, or to Yogiraj Siddhanath. Even Sivananda, a Devout Hindu, still called Jesus "The Lord" in his writings, yet Sivananda accomplished what he did without the Christian Scripture and without worshipping Christ.

As far as hermetics being older than Judaism, it is quite true, though it wasn't renamed after Hermes until several centuries afterwards. Hermetics originated in ancient Egypt under the rule of Pharaoh Thutmose III (1500-1447 B.C), who took the scattered mystery schools of the time and organized them as one complete Brotherhood of initiates. In ancient Egypt, all of the princes and kings were trained in these mystery schools, and so it is quite conceivable that Moses himself was trained in one as a child, being a prince of Egypt.

Once again I reiterate that if you want to believe that Christianity is the only way because it says so, then we are all infidels and worthy of death...because the Quran says so. Perhaps I should take my gay neighbor out to the field and stone him to death...because the Tanakh says so. Anyone can say "this is wright because it says it's right." Of course it says its right! I doubt anyone who wanted people to believe their teachings would start by saying "believe this because it is wrong". Christianity says "This man does miracles because God works through him". Perhaps this is true, but even God must observe the Universal Laws that HE established, or else the foundation to our universe would break. As such, the magician examines the cause of

these miraculous effects. It is no secret that to turn water into Wine you can project your consciousness into the Akasa of the water and transmute it from within itself, or that reviving the dead is done by re-establishing the broken astral umbilical chord and directing the spirit back to the physical body. Are these simple task? By no means, and only a truly spiritual man is capable of such phenomena, but they are explained nonetheless. Does explaining it make it not a miracle? Yes. A miracle is something that is miraculous simply because we don't understand it.

Perhaps one of the main problems is that you see Magick as extraneous, while I see religion as extraneous and one-sided. Why work for something you can get for free from God? I don't know...why walk when we can drive? Why go to school if you're born into a rich family. Why learn carpentry when you can buy a chair at the store? Why learn to read when you can always listen? Why learn to think when you can always be told what to believe? Why learn to read the Bible when the priest can always tell you what HE thinks about it? Seems like a bunch of lazy procrastination to me. Rather, I would rather walk through a beautiful country side, then blow by it in a car, because I can perfect myself. I would rather Go to school if I was born into a rich family, because I can perfect myself. I would rather learn carpentry, because I can perfect myself. I would rather learn to read, because in doing so I perfect myself. I would rather learn to think than be told what to believe, because I can perfect myself in doing so. I would rather read the bible myself than listen to the preacher, so that I can think and through it, yes, perfect myself. But why perfect myself when it clearly says in the bible that it is by God's GRACE alone that you enter into Heaven? Because damnit, I can do a hell of alot more help to those around me if I have perfected the tools to help them.

Logged

Soham Sivoham Aham Brahma Asmi Mahavakya

Suddha satchitananda purna parabrahma

Chidananda Rupa Sivoham Sivoham

Zohar

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 111

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #25 on: June 14, 2007, 07:35:03 PM »

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 05:26:43 PM

Quote from: Zohar

I explained grocery shopping Christianity to be picking and choosing what rules you want to follow and when you want to walk closer with God/Jesus/Buddha/whatever in accordance with how convenient it is for you at the time. Nowhere in what I wrote, did I

ever say ANYTHING about faith not being important. The above statements were meant to explain how telling us that striving for divine interaction, (even if by our own means), is not needed because Jesus is the way to God and following the path of the righteous Christian only when you deem it convenient because your belief in Jesus links you to heaven, (no matter what), are much alike in their own respects.

And I explained how faith was important, regardless of you ever saying anything about faith. After the first paragraph, here I wasn't even arguing with you.

So then why'd you use my quote in there if it wasn't an argument against me? And moreover, what was the comment "You've obviously never been in the presence of a Christian saint, or at least researched a few, have you?" even in there for if it wasn't being used as an argument? It definitely seemed like it was a counter argument aimed in my direction for arguments sake, (even though there was no statement for that argument to counter). The saints have nothing to do with the certain Christians' "Grocery-Shopping" attitude. They are their own group, and aren't in particular related to saints of Christianity. However, if the above argument was to point out there are good Christians in the church too, then yes, I am aware of that fact. The "I do what I want" Christians are only another group within the Church, along with all the fundamentalists, evangelists, bigots, hermits, paedophiles, killers, whores, and the minute few "good" Christians. However, a lot of the occultists that are ex-orthodox Christians I have met were in search of something different because of either the "grocery shopping" or the fundamentalism. I wasn't using the term to describe Christianity as a whole.

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 05:26:43 PM

Quote

Also, your saint psycho-babble-bullshit is just meant to throw facts in the faces of the more easily swayed.

1. Please do not be so vulgar and offensive. It serves no purpose and it counter-conducive to a good argument. If you were debating on a forensics team, you wouldn't suddenly use a word like "bullshit" in front of a panel of judges, would you?
2. You misunderstood the point of me saying that entirely if you believe I only said that to "throw facts in the faces of the more easily swayed."

First off, I reserve the right to use the occasional 'shit' or 'fuck'. Even PG-13 movies are allowed 1 'shit' per scene and one 'fuck' throughout of the movie. Secondly, this isn't a debate in front of a forensics team, it is a debate on a forum. I am not out to impress anyone, I only present my opinions and interpretations up front. If you don't like the way I present these facts or the way I type, feel free to ignore my comments all together. However, I'm not going to play nice just because people get offended once in a while by the occasional cuss word.

Also, it is entirely possible that I may have misunderstood what you said, much like how everyone else on this board has misunderstood people from time to time. Also, it was

meant to be more of an introductory sentence, not to be insulting or judgemental. Yes, I could have and should have rephrased it, but that is the manner in which I wrote it, and I am not too terribly upset.

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 05:26:43 PM

You seem somewhat offended, Zohar. Is there a problem? You give the impression of yelling. You also misunderstood in many places...

Perhaps you misunderstood me, I am not in the least angry, frustrated, or minutely distempered... I speak and type in a very straight-forward manner, as I stated above. I don't expect people to go out of their way to be nice to me, and I also don't feel that it is entirely necessary for me to walk around on eggshells so I don't hurt someones feelings. I've always been fond of the "Agree to Disagree" rule.

Quote from: Oriens Lvx Lucis on June 14, 2007, 05:26:43 PM

Quote from: Zohar

Lastly, since everyone else feels that every single quote out there is absolute truth, I will leave you all with this one

1. This is a large generalization, and at that, it is completely unnecessary. In fact, it is much more reasonable to assume that most people don't think every quote is absolute truth. Generalizations are also logical fallacies.
2. This seems to be an expression of frustration. Sorry if you were offended by something, but no need to make a dramatic statement which is quite obviously wrong.
3. That quote is only attributed to Aleister Crowley because he is the author of the book in regards to G.H. Frater. G.H. Frater is the actual author of the quote.

I am also sarcastic from time to time. That was a failed shot at a little bit of humour.. But, none the less, you should be able to distinguish sarcasm from blatant frustration and generalization. Don't forget to stick a "But, sarcasm is a logical fallacy also." in there.. Or I'll be horribly disappointed.

On another note, I was unaware of the quote being attributed to G. H. Frater... Thanks for that tad bit of info.

For the record:

By reading the statements enclosed above, you are fully accepting liability for reading the sarcasm and crude manner of writing contained therein. Much of that which has been afore stated has not been presented "properly". But, should the reader choose to read it regardless, I hold no accountability for sounding frustrated or angry, as that is your own interpretation of my mood.

Logged

G-d created the world in the image of the world above; all which is found above has its analogy below... and everything constitutes a unity.

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #26 on: June 14, 2007, 08:30:35 PM »

Veos: As for the first paragraph, I hope you got your rants out cause most of that had nothing to do with anything I've been saying in this thread. Your presupposition that Jesus was a magician is at least as bad as my supposition that he wasn't, worse because his own disciples didn't claim him as a magician but instead as the Son of God who's power came not from learning mysticism from "mystery schools" (the contents of which you don't even know anything of, hence why they're called mystery schools, so it's at best a long shot to say they taught the same things that hermetics does today) but from having authority given to him directly by God.

Why did Jesus tell his disciples things apart from the crowd? To prepare them, for they were the only ones who were with him for his entire three year ministry. The crowds were different people in each city, though perhaps a handful of people continually followed him from place to place in order to listen to his messages as he shouted them out. But even when he told them directly what the parables meant, more often than not they still didn't understand. Why? Because God had cast a shadow over their minds so that they would not understand fully until many days after Jesus was taken back up into heaven when they were gathered together and the Holy Spirit came upon them, in Acts chapter 2. It was then that they began to truly understand the message of Christ. The apostles claimed the miracles came from God. You claim they came from magic. I'll go with what his own disciples who were with him for the entire three years said.

Quote

As far as hermetics being older than Judaism, it is quite true, though it wasn't renamed after Hermes until several centuries afterwards. Hermetics originated in ancient Egypt under the rule of Pharaoh Thutmose III (1500-1447 B.C), who took the scattered mystery schools of the time and organized them as one complete Brotherhood of initiates. In ancient Egypt, all of the princes and kings were trained in these mystery schools, and so it is quite conceivable that Moses himself was trained in one as a child, being a prince of Egypt.

Once again speculative as to what the mystery schools taught. Many of the ideas that are now a part of hermetics existed before hermetics as a whole did, but hermeticism itself did not. It's also highly doubtful that a foreigner learned egyptian magic better than the people who were devoted to their gods, as evidenced by the egyptian priests being

able to replicate the first few miracles but not the next few. Why? Well, Moses claims it wasn't Moses doing the miracles, but you can disregard Moses' own words and stuff your own into his mouth if you really want to. I'll go with what Moses said.

Once again, I reiterate that I'm not saying Christianity is the only way, though Jesus himself did say that, but am simply not caring about magic in this thread. I am putting forth christianity and saying it can be done alone, and all the "benefits" that can be found in any magical path can also be found in christianity, so why bother with a magical path?

" Anyone can say "this is wright because it says it's right." " True. I say to myself that it's right because God told me it's right. I say to others "this is what the bible says" because it's an objective authority on christianity that anyone can see. Should I believe you, or God? Kabalists believe what lesser spirits tell them, so why should I disregard what the Greatest Spirit tells me?

"but even God must observe the Universal Laws that HE established, or else the foundation to our universe would break." Like hell He does. He made it, He can change it. He can stop it from "breaking" by His own authority. Or do you believe God is so powerless that His own creation can crumble before Him?

"It is no secret that to turn water into Wine you can project your consciousness into the Akasa of the water and transmute it from within itself, or that reviving the dead is done by re-establishing the broken astral umbilical chord and directing the spirit back to the physical body." Wow. logical fallacy time again. Just because something can be done by one method, doesn't mean it's the only method it can be done by. You yourself have been saying that at me regarding how people can come to God and yet you are not willing to acknowledge that while a magician can do such things that God Himself cannot do them except by the ways the magicians have figured out.

Why why why, blah blah blah. The point of Christianity is to come closer to God. Why bother with magical feats if they are not that goal? Even Prophecy has said that the primary objective of the Qabalist is to come closer to God. This thread, however, was started with the assumption of the magical feats within the physical world, which is quite a different perspective to be taking.

"why perfect myself when it clearly says in the bible that it is by God's GRACE alone that you enter into Heaven? Because damnit, I can do a hell of alot more help to those around me if I have perfected the tools to help them. " Well, that's one good reason to perfect one's self, but if God gives me His Holy Spirit can I not do the same things by the power of God rather than the power of men? Is that so wrong? Ultimately though, such helpings are useless because while they portray your love, the pain and the relief are only temporary things anyway; all of that will go away when we go to the next realm, regardless. Does that mean we shouldn't do them? Of course not. Helping people to God is more important by far, but helping people with their physical problems because

we love them is also important in God's eyes.

My point is NOT "don't use magic" but is "why should a Christian use magic (since this thread is about CHRISTIANS and magic, not about magic itself) when God will give you everything through Jesus if you just turn to Him and be healed?" Christians are already on the christian path, so why should they bother starting down another one that adds nothing to them? All of the benefits found in modern qabala are already to be found in Christ if one actually seeks.

~Steve

In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord seated on a throne, high and exalted, and the train of his robe filled the temple. Above him were seraphs, each with six wings: With two wings they covered their faces, with two they covered their feet, and with two they were flying. And they were calling to one another:

"Holy, holy, holy is the LORD Almighty;
the whole earth is full of his glory."

At the sound of their voices the doorposts and thresholds shook and the temple was filled with smoke.

"Woe to me!" I cried. "I am ruined! For I am a man of unclean lips, and I live among a people of unclean lips, and my eyes have seen the King, the LORD Almighty."

Then one of the seraphs flew to me with a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with tongs from the altar. With it he touched my mouth and said, "See, this has touched your lips; your guilt is taken away and your sin atoned for."

Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?"

And I said, "Here am I. Send me!"

He said, "Go and tell this people:

" 'Be ever hearing, but never understanding;
be ever seeing, but never perceiving.'

Make the heart of this people calloused;
make their ears dull
and close their eyes.
Otherwise they might see with their eyes,
hear with their ears,
understand with their hearts,
and turn and be healed."

« Last Edit: June 14, 2007, 08:39:37 PM by Steve » Logged
Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.
Veos

Veritas Moderator

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 466

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #27 on: June 14, 2007, 11:36:28 PM »

I don't understand why magick can't compliment a religion. Aside from that, I never stated anywhere that Jesus was a magician, but that he was an initiate, which is a degree in Magickal, mystical, and religious brotherhoods. Friend, you once told me that you felt as if God was leading you to magick for some reason. If he is, then you are truly kicking and screaming the whole way.

As far as what the ancient mystery schools taught, almost all scholars agree that it was a system of magick very similar to what developed into Hermetics, which is evident in the tablets that they have been able to restore from those time periods, particularly in the tombs of the Pharaohs.

Quote from: Steve on June 14, 2007, 08:30:35 PM

The apostles claimed the miracles came from God. You claim they came from magic. I'll go with what his own disciples who were with him for the entire three years said.

When did I claim that? Just because magick explains it, doesn't mean that magick caused it, although this depends on what definition of magick is used. If we consider it to be the transmission of power at will, or to cause change in conformity with will, then everything Christ did was an act of magick. Certainly faith requires Will.

Christianity, in the manner that you are presenting it, is mystical. It revolves wholly around God, and the receiving of his divinity is the only goal. But still, such a Christian would most likely find himself incapable of healing another person in need, until they received this Holy Union. As a Christian magician, you "branch out" so to say, and are given the blessing of being able to help more people, even if you haven't received the Holy Spirit yet. The goal of magick is spiritual evolution, and to close the doors on any possible means of this development due to religious one-sidedness is to inhibit the growth of the Spirit. Why practice magick as a Christian? Well, why not, if there are only benefits to be received from it. As a Christian you should be primarily concerned with following the commandments given by Christ, so why not train yourself to be able to more effectively carry out those commands?

As far as the "esoteric side" of Christ is concerned, unfortunately there aren't enough

scholars who all agree on the date of the Apocryphal Gospels, but most agree that the Gospel of Peter (which clearly illustrates an Esoteric christ) was written at about the same time 2 or 3 of the New Testament Gospels were written. What do all of the Apocryphal Gospels have in common? They represent Christ as an initiate, as someone who actually worked for what he attained. The Gospel of Nicodemus is particularly beautiful, but was disregarded by the council due to one line. This of course could have been for several reasons. Perhaps these esoteric gospels weren't included because they aren't true. Perhaps they were disregarded because the idea of a person being able to receive the Holy Spirit through hard work and dedication takes the power away from the Church over the people, and they lose ground to control the masses with. But, everything concerning them is more or less speculation. Did Christ know the Kabbalah? If it is a divine science, then I would hope so. If not, then it matters little whether he knew it or not. Did Christ perform rituals and other magickal operations? Of course not, that notion is ridiculous. Still, the idea that "magick is extraneous for a Christian" is the same as saying "religion is extraneous for a magician". If you are going to be spiritual, then why not understand those things in the universe that are spiritual? Why not investigate the spiritual realms, if there is only benefit to be received from it. Why not train to learn how to manipulate the Electric and Magnetic Fluids, if it allows you to heal others? That seems more Christian than sitting around hoping that God imparts the Holy Spirit to you. Such a scene instantly brings to mind the idea of a bunch of mindless animals waiting in a pit for the master to come feed them.

Logged

Soham Sivoham Aham Brahma Asmi Mahavakya

Suddha satchitananda purna parabrahma

Chidananda Rupa Sivoham Sivoham

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatible

« Reply #28 on: June 15, 2007, 01:53:40 AM »

Quote from: Steve on June 14, 2007, 05:12:24 PM

Quote

Why do anything at all if God is capable of doing everything for us?

There are two reasons I see:

1. He clearly doesn't do everything for us, which should be a huge hint about his goals.
 2. We grow by doing things and learning from the resulting experiences.
- Why do anything? Because we love God and *desire* to do what He wants us to.

So then we can use this same decision making process which leads us to, say, take a job, or learn how to quilt, and use is it to lead us to learn the metaphysical arts.

Quote from: Steve on June 14, 2007, 05:12:24 PM

He is the one who gave us life. He is the one who gave us food in the garden. He is the one who gave us everything we needed in the beginning. He took care of us then so why do you say it is so bad for Him to take care of us now? Why do you say "we need to go it alone" when God says "come to me, all you who are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest"?

First, the Genesis story is clearly metaphorical. But if we work within the metaphor, note that attaining knowledge of good and evil coincides with being kicked out of the garden. Thus, our knowledge of good, and thus spiritual growth, coincides with God not doing everything for us.

Quote from: Steve on June 14, 2007, 05:12:24 PM

Kobok: Why is it that God says "trust in Me" yet you say "trust in reason"? God is greater than reason; even if reason is man's greatest attribute it pales in comparison to the majesty and truth of God.

Tell me how you will differentiate God from an evil being without using reason. You cannot trust in God until you have first identified God.

Logged
Steve
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #29 on: June 15, 2007, 08:57:33 AM »

"Still, the idea that "magick is extraneous for a Christian" is the same as saying "religion is extraneous for a magician". " In the sense that religion means institutionalized rituals built around ideologies or theologies, then yes those are also extraneous. The church was formed as a bride for Christ and Christ died for God's people, not the other way around, therefore we should seek Jesus and Jehovah, not the church or religion. Those who belong to God naturally belong to "the church" because that is what God's church is (the gathering of His people), so once again the point is to focus on Jehovah and not something lesser.

John 3:

27To this John replied, "A man can receive only what is given him from heaven. 28You yourselves can testify that I said, 'I am not the Christ but am sent ahead of him.' 29The bride belongs to the bridegroom. The friend who attends the bridegroom waits and listens for him, and is full of joy when he hears the bridegroom's voice. That joy is mine, and it is now complete. 30He must become greater; I must become less.

As for sitting around waiting for stuff from God; a person could try that, but if they love God then they will get up off their butts and go out and do stuff because of that love. I am not the only one of this opinion, for the apostles also adamantly push it forward.

James 1:

22Do not merely listen to the word, and so deceive yourselves. Do what it says. 23Anyone who listens to the word but does not do what it says is like a man who looks at his face in a mirror 24and, after looking at himself, goes away and immediately forgets what he looks like. 25But the man who looks intently into the perfect law that gives freedom, and continues to do this, not forgetting what he has heard, but doing it—he will be blessed in what he does.

26If anyone considers himself religious and yet does not keep a tight rein on his tongue, he deceives himself and his religion is worthless. 27Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world.

Acts 26:20

First to those in Damascus, then to those in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and to the Gentiles also, I preached that they should repent and turn to God and prove their repentance by their deeds.

1 Timothy 6:

17Command those who are rich in this present world not to be arrogant nor to put their hope in wealth, which is so uncertain, but to put their hope in God, who richly provides us with everything for our enjoyment. 18Command them to do good, to be rich in good deeds, and to be generous and willing to share. 19In this way they will lay up treasure for themselves as a firm foundation for the coming age, so that they may take hold of the life that is truly life.

James 2:

14What good is it, my brothers, if a man claims to have faith but has no deeds? Can such faith save him? 15Suppose a brother or sister is without clothes and daily food. 16If one of you says to him, "Go, I wish you well; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about his physical needs, what good is it? 17In the same way, faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action, is dead.

18But someone will say, "You have faith; I have deeds."

Show me your faith without deeds, and I will show you my faith by what I do.

19You believe that there is one God. Good! Even the demons believe that—and shudder.

20You foolish man, do you want evidence that faith without deeds is useless[d]? 21Was not our ancestor Abraham considered righteous for what he did when he offered his son Isaac on the altar? 22You see that his faith and his actions were working together, and his faith was made complete by what he did. 23And the scripture was fulfilled that says, "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness,"[e] and he was called God's friend. 24You see that a person is justified by what he does and not by faith alone.

25In the same way, was not even Rahab the prostitute considered righteous for what she did when she gave lodging to the spies and sent them off in a different direction? 26As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without deeds is dead.

1 Peter 2:12

Live such good lives among the pagans that, though they accuse you of doing wrong, they may see your good deeds and glorify God on the day he visits us.

Once again, God provides us everything, so if you seek things beyond this then that is up to you but is, by definition, ultimately extraneous. God has been pushing me to learn about hermeticism/qabalism lately but not as a mandatory core thing, simply as something to learn for the sake of learning. (and it might also interest you to know that I went kicking and screaming into christianity Tongue)

Kobok: "So then we can use this same decision making process which leads us to, say, take a job, or learn how to quilt, and use is it to lead us to learn the metaphysical arts." As my reply above, so my reply below >_> Such things are ultimately extraneous. God has told us what He desires we do and it mostly focuses around doing good things for one another. Paul told thieves to stop stealing and to get an honest job. The apostles exalted the women who quilted and provided clothing for the poor. I have yet to see the NT declare that we should learn magic, but instead from Moses and the prophets to Jesus and the apostles, it says to seek the Lord; if the Lord provides us with abilities for the benefit of others, that's quite different from learning such things for ourselves even if we use those things to help others (I'm not saying such things are necessarily bad, unless part of the list God already said is bad, but it is different than relying upon the Lord).

Even if we both agree that the creation story is just a story, the entire bible is filled with examples and teachings that God can, and desires to, do good things for us and give us good things.

"Tell me how you will differentiate God from an evil being without using reason. You

cannot trust in God until you have first identified God." Even a child can tell a good parent from a bad parent: a bad parent causes pain and suffering whenever he/she is frustrated and takes out such frustrations on others, but a good parent is forgiving and helpful towards the child even if the parent must at times discipline the child.

Obviously one must first know who they are worshiping before they can worship them, but once one has found the Lord and have learned of the trustworthiness of the Lord then why continue to test the Lord? When will you turn your doubt into trust?

~Steve

"Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives; he who seeks finds; and to him who knocks, the door will be opened.

"Which of you, if his son asks for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake? If you, then, though you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good gifts to those who ask him! So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets.

« Last Edit: June 15, 2007, 09:00:59 AM by Steve » Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 8Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C10604.30.html>

1 capture

7 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 12:09:24 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

166543 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Discussion Areas

||-+ Magick

|||-+ Christianity and Magick are Compatable 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 8 Print

Author Topic: Christianity and Magick are Compatable (Read 6534 times)

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

View Profile

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #30 on: June 15, 2007, 09:31:49 AM »

Quote from: Zohar

So then why'd you use my quote in there if it wasn't an argument against me? And moreover, what was the comment "You've obviously never been in the presence of a Christian saint, or at least researched a few, have you?" even in there for if it wasn't being used as an argument?

Because I wanted to. It wasn't specifically directed at you, and I apologize if it was implied otherwise.

Quote from: Zohar

The saints have nothing to do with the certain Christians' "Grocery-Shopping" attitude.

In this context no, they don't. I wasn't arguing with specifically you there, that's why it isn't related.

Quote from: Zohar

First off, I reserve the right to use the occasional 'shit' or 'fuck'. Even PG-13 movies are allowed 1 'shit' per scene and one 'fuck' throughout of the movie. Secondly, this isn't a debate in front of a forensics team, it is a debate on a _forum_. I am not out to impress anyone, I only present my opinions and interpretations up front. If you don't like the way I present these facts or the way I type, feel free to ignore my comments all together. However, I'm not going to play nice just because people get offended once in a while by the occasional cuss word.

1. Hence, I used the word "please" when I asked.

2. The forensics judges are there to judge your argument and how well you present it, not just to watch you and give you an incentive to do better. If you wouldn't do something in front of them, it should obviously not be done in any well organized and presented argument. However, you admitted the mistake, and this is after all a public forum, so it isn't harmful per se (though it does degrade the value of an argument).

Quote

That was a failed shot at a little bit of humour.. But, none the less, you should be able to distinguish sarcasm from blatant frustration and generalization.

It was obviously sarcasm. But I still made comment because in my experience, sarcasm is only used (intentionally or otherwise) as a break (temporary or otherwise) from an argument or debate; i.e. a stall. Also detrimental to an argument. Keep in mind I am not attacking you, just the way in which you present your argument, which would otherwise be very good.

As for the actual point of this argument:

Quote from: Steve

Because God had cast a shadow over their minds

This is a very dramatic statement. From a logical perspective, it also would be detrimental to God's "design." I don't see any reason, nor have I ever, why Divine Providence would choose to directly immerse itself in the lives of human beings unless there were a highly important purpose to be fulfilled, and even then, it would be as inconspicuous as possible. If anything, God would have aided Jesus, but there would be no reason why He would purposely make them misunderstand. It is more work than necessary, and universal machinery is called so for a reason: it does not do what is unnecessary to a given project, and it does so strategically. If the apostles did not understand, it is much more likely that they were simply unable to comprehend Jesus' words, even when openly explained (which in of itself is unlikely).

Quote from: Steve

Once again, I reiterate that I'm not saying Christianity is the only way, though Jesus himself did say that, but am simply not caring about magic in this thread.

There are many ways to interpret what Jesus said. Additionally, John's Gospel was 1. Created last, so it would naturally have a lesser precedence over other gospels, where Jesus says nothing of the sort, and 2. Heavily, heavily metaphorical and philosophical. The symbolism in that gospel makes words like the ones who say Jesus stated much different in interpretation. The traditional Christian method of interpretation is not the only one.

Additionally, the only gospel in which Jesus ever says directly that he is the son of God is in John's, and even then he does not say he is the only one (though it is implied). He also says that any person can do what he did and more, and reach what he had and above. In fact, it is more as if he is implying that all people are the same as him, albeit they are not as advanced spiritually.

Quote from: Steve

I am putting forth christianity and saying it can be done alone, and all the "benefits" that can be found in any magical path can also be found in christianity, so why bother with a magical path.

That question is easily answered. Not all people can find salvation through Christianity. The religion is simply not suitable for them. Ideally, a Christian should not be like 99% of Christians you see today, but more like the monks who develop themselves through extreme service to mankind and God and the highest possible devotion. These are the type of people whom don't need to go to such things as mass; they are in a continual state of mass, literally praying for hours at a time. They are akin to the Tibetan monks who meditate for most of an entire day and eat only what is needed. In the Western world, this is not possible for most people, and so they turn to other spiritual methods, such as occultism, or they simply turn out like the other 90% of the population -- believing that they will be saved if they do not make any attempt to change their sins and be good and upright people, dedicating their lives and ambitions to God, and simply going to mass for maybe an hour or two every Sunday. Honestly, when looked at logically, little could be more ridiculous than believing such a thing, yet most Christians do so (including many priests and bishops...). Why? Because the religion has corrupted since it's inception, and now the only requirement is to go to mass, go through as many sacraments as possible, and confess one's sins. One does not even need to pray anymore to be saved?!?! No, traditional "religion" does nothing more than give most people a comfortable illusion through which they can live their lives with having something to fall back on. In order to truly be religious, one must strive in every possible way to emulate Jesus, and while it is fairly easy to say that one does this, unless you have devotion and faith enough to duplicate what he did, and reach near or the same spiritual attainment, then you are doing something wrong.

This leads us to the recurring quote, "Occultism points the way to Christ when faith alone cannot find him." by Max Heindel.

What does this mean? Again, obviously most people are either not capable or not willing to emulate Jesus or a similar spiritual master of similar caliber in every single

action they do, which would be the necessary thing to do in true Christianity. How many people cannot even go for a week without telling even a small lie to someone? How many cannot go for a week without talking about someone without gossiping? How many actually pray to their God at a given time in the day, when their entire being is devoted to conversation and communion with Him? How many cannot go for a single week without knowingly sinning in some way? Not many, and a relative few of the human population can. This is why there are other paths; true religion is not suitable for all. Although these things; abstaining from sin, should still be incorporated into every type and style of path, they are not as necessary, especially early on, in occultism. They are slower for this reason, but they do lead to the same place. Occultism is common in the West (such as Rosicrucianism, which is essentially a blend of occultism and Christianity) because not all people, especially in the West, are actually ready to devote their entire lives, their entire will, and every single action, word, and thought to God. They are not ready to. Thus, some become occultists or set out on another path, with the same ambition and goal to reach as any other person on any other style/type of path, but in a different manner and approach.

Quote from: Steve

Why did Jesus tell his disciples things apart from the crowd? To prepare them, for they were the only ones who were with him for his entire three year ministry.

He also initiated them higher than any other individual he came into contact with, and told them things which he did not ever even speak to the crowds. And yes, it was to prepare them for their eventual ministry, but it was also because he knew that they were actually ready for the information they were to receive. You would not tell a five year old how to use a gun, or worse, give one to such, would you? In the same way, compared to Jesus, almost every other person he came into contact with was spiritually a child. Spirituality grants power eventually, and knowledge which can be used for many purposes, harm to other people (though realistically, any power or authority would probably be revoked eventually by God if it was misused) and can even cause different types of harm to oneself if the individual is not ready. For example, if a person passes the Abyss before they are not ready (essentially, the highest possible human attainment in life; spiritual enlightenment) then they would probably become insane and deranged. This can also be compared to the "light of God" which is said to destroy people when they come face to face with it and witness it. They are unready, and so are annihilated (in the physical sense, not referring to the soul), while the ready can truly see it in awe. Most of the Hermetic law of Silence in modern times is derived from the proverb; "Do not place your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet" from Jesus. Do not give to someone who is not ready to receive it. It is a very basic principle, one which applies to everything, including spiritual knowledge and attainment. Police officers are trained before they can wield weapons which would allow them to do things against the law; what they are trying to defend. Initiates (here referring to a person of grade in any form of spirituality) are trained in the Lesser Mysteries before the Greater Mysteries because they are not ready for the higher knowledge which they would have access to and be taught. They are trained one step at a time, their master teaches them based on a foundation. If you try to carry too much up a flight of stairs, you will

surely have to halt, or worse, trip and fall. Therefore a proper foundation is given, and from there, step by step, one must prove himself worthy before he is given knowledge which he would otherwise be unready for and could subsequently be harmful and detrimental to his spiritual progress.

Quote from: Steve

My point is NOT "don't use magic" but is "why should a Christian use magic

Every path has it's advantages and disadvantages, though the end result is the same and upon making it to the "summit of the mountain" or end of sorts. However, in beginning, does God automatically walk with a person who is Christian? No, otherwise upon being baptized, we would see millions more people who could manifest signs through the holy Spirit. You have to prove yourself worthy to God (though he will still help you) before God will begin to go out of His way to aid you. Magic provides an advantage which Christianity doesn't have, or any religion for that matter: seeking power is actually necessary, while in most religions, it is strongly advised against. A relatively good magician can begin to control the weather well in about 2 or 3 years with dedicated practice. How long would this take with Christianity? Well, first of all, one must practice devotion and prayer very well. God will undoubtedly help you if you pray to Him, but you will not get the same results that say, a magician could get as soon through prayer.

Secondly, in religion, if you have not trained yourself magically, you are essentially relying on God's power to protect you. Is there anything wrong with this? No, and it works well. However, let us say a magician wants to do something which does not directly aid mankind. Usually, this is not allowed when you use God's power (through prayer, etc) because there would be no good reason. It is much more powerful, and holy, and unlike a human's own will, you are using the holy Spirit to manifest change for yourself. In all cases of the Bible, we see that signs were manifested so that someone other than the prophet could be aided, healed, helped, etc. for a good reason. This does not have to be so in magic. Now, arguing whether or not a magician should actually be doing magic for something which does not always help mankind is irrelevant, but in the end, the answer is a usual no.

That's the reason. You can argue it, but logically it's true. Regardless of whether or not one should be using magic for something which the holy Spirit would not be allowed to manifest in most cases, magic is sometimes more able to do things than individual religious people.

Namaste

EDIT: It seems that I entered this post soon after Steve, as the reply was made before I posted this. If there are any points aimed at me, I'll respond to them at another time.

Logged
Steve
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #31 on: June 15, 2007, 01:44:58 PM »

"This is a very dramatic statement. From a logical perspective, it also would be detrimental to God's "design." I don't see any reason, nor have I ever, why Divine Providence would choose to directly immerse itself in the lives of human beings unless there were a highly important purpose to be fulfilled, and even then, it would be as inconspicuous as possible." Have you READ the Old Testament?! It's FILLED with stories of God directly immersing Himself in the lives of us, His loved creation.

"If anything, God would have aided Jesus, but there would be no reason why He would purposely make them misunderstand." I'll find the quote later, but it says directly in the gospels that God prevented the apostles from understanding because it wasn't yet time for them to understand.

"The traditional Christian method of interpretation is not the only one. " What interpretation? John records Jesus as saying "No one comes to the Father except through me". There's no interpretation. It's simply accepting it at face value. And I'm pretty sure the other gospels mention the same idea but with different words. I'll look for it later.

"Additionally, the only gospel in which Jesus ever says directly that he is the son of God is in John's" Nope. Gabriel, who visited Mary according to Luke 1:31, foretold that Jesus would be called Son of the Most High. Have you never actually checked the credibility of the "secrets" you've learned in your kaballah, to see whether they actually fit with scripture or are just made up ideas?

Quote

26In the sixth month, God sent the angel Gabriel to Nazareth, a town in Galilee,
27to a virgin pledged to be married to a man named Joseph, a descendant of David.

The virgin's name was Mary. 28The angel went to her and said, "Greetings, you who are highly favored! The Lord is with you."

29Mary was greatly troubled at his words and wondered what kind of greeting this might be. 30But the angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, you have found favor with God. 31You will be with child and give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus. 32He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, 33and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever; his kingdom will never end."

34"How will this be," Mary asked the angel, "since I am a virgin?"

35The angel answered, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called[c] the Son of God. 36Even Elizabeth your relative is going to have a child in her old age, and she who was said to be barren is in her sixth month. 37For nothing is impossible with God."

38"I am the Lord's servant," Mary answered. "May it be to me as you have said." Then the angel left her.

Oh, and Matthew records DEMONS declaring Jesus as the Son of God:

Matthew 8:29

"What do you want with us, Son of God?" they shouted. "Have you come here to torture us before the appointed time?"

Angels and even unclean spirits acknowledge Jesus as the son of God, yet you do not. Since you yourself say the synoptic gospels are so "authoritative" you can't really weasel your way out of this one, now can you? Smiley

By the way, click [here](#) all the listings of "son of god" and see for yourself where it is actually declared and by whom.

"Not all people can find salvation through Christianity." Incorrect. The promise and invitation is given to the whole world. EVERYONE can come to God through Jesus.

"Again, obviously most people are either not capable or not willing to emulate Jesus or a similar spiritual master of similar caliber in every single action they do, which would be the necessary thing to do in true Christianity." Well, thankfully the Lord is forgiving then, no? Or do you not accept that either? Will you go to heaven with your sins still on your head and say to God "look at how great I am, and what I have accomplished? See how marvelous I am and what a great addition to heaven I would make? You're lucky to have me."

Humble yourself before the Lord and He will lift you up. Do you still not understand that which is put out for the whole world to see? Do you still search after secrets when you don't understand what is blatantly said?

"He also initiated them higher than any other individual he came into contact with" So says you, but they don't say that.

"but it was also because he knew that they were actually ready for the information they were to receive" They were not ready, and once again I'll get the quote later.

"magic is sometimes more able to do things than individual religious people." but if those things are not beneficial, then does it matter that they can be done?

~Steve

Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #32 on: June 15, 2007, 02:59:21 PM »

Quote from: Steve on June 15, 2007, 08:57:33 AM

Obviously one must first know who they are worshipping before they can worship them, but once one has found the Lord and have learned of the trustworthiness of the Lord then why continue to test the Lord? When will you turn your doubt into trust?

Using reason is no more testing God than steering is testing the road.

Logged

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #33 on: June 15, 2007, 03:59:08 PM »

Steven, your argument isn't working.

1. We explained to you, clearly I might add, why magic/metaphysics would be useful for any Christian.

2. We don't denote the same importance of the Bible that you do, so simply spouting out quotes from it won't work, whether you believe them to be true or not.

Namaste

Logged

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

View Profile

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #34 on: June 15, 2007, 09:05:49 PM »

The bible speaks for itself clearly about where a man's heart should lie, and where his mind should dwell.

<http://bibleresources.bible.com/passagesearchresults.php?passage1=Psalm+78&version=31>

Edit: Oh, and "my" arguments aren't working because you will not listen. That is not a problem with me or the bible, since that is where my arguments came from, so I suggest you spend more time learning before you say "I won't listen to your arguments, therefore they fail because of some other reason." Smiley

There are plenty of things that could be useful to a christian that are extraneous. But are they really useful in the end? Salvation comes from the Lord, what more could a person want or need that really makes a difference in the end?

~Steve

« Last Edit: June 15, 2007, 10:33:13 PM by Steve » Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #35 on: June 16, 2007, 09:57:53 AM »
Steve, your arguments are fallacious.

Quote from: Steve

The bible speaks for itself clearly about where a man's heart should lie, and where his mind should dwell.

No, you see it that way. There are other interpretations besides yours, and not everyone attaches the same importance to the bible that you do. Thus, it is a fallacy to try to simply quote from it for evidence, especially if all of your quotes have more than your single interpretation.

Quote from: Steve

Oh, and "my" arguments are not working because you will not listen.

No, they are not working because not everyone attaches the same importance to the Bible that you do, nor does everyone use the same interpretation that you do (and yes, there are many more interpretations than your own). I explained this above. It would be more accurate to say that your argument is not working because most people are not listening to it, as you know have most people arguing against you (which should be evidence of something...). They don't find the same importance in the Bible that you do, and/or they don't use the same or even a similar interpretation that you use. Let's look at the forensics example once more (and yes, I am aware that this is "just" a forum). If you were debating with an atheist in front of a panel of judges, would you try to just quote the Bible in order to augment your argument, or worse, base your entire argument off of it? No, because then you would lose the debate very fast. And still, even if this is not a "serious" forensics type debate, you should at least try to emulate what you would do in front of judges when they are not there (because if you would not argue a point in front of them, then it would logically be an erroneous point, and one which doesn't have a place in any argument). The only time you could use the Bible as you are currently, Steve, is if

1. Everyone had the same interpretation as you, and
2. Everyone felt the same way about the Bible as you do.

This is obviously not so...

Quote from: Steve

That is not a problem with me or the bible

You, yes; the bible, no.

Quote from: Steve

There are plenty of things that could be useful to a christian that are extraneous. But are they really useful in the end? Salvation comes from the Lord, what more could a person need that really makes a difference in the end?

Steve, we've repeatedly explained this to you (or at least I did, in an earlier post).

1. And a magician could say, "What need is there for Christianity when we have magic?" The answer is that all the paths are equal to each other. Some people are suited to one path, and not another one. Not everyone can be religious, mystical, magical, etc. Don't think of one path as any better (if you weren't, then you were implying this strongly throughout your argument) than another. They have advantages and disadvantages over each other.

2. We've also repeatedly said that you don't need magic if you are on another path. As long as you are on at least one and following it as you should be, you are fine. Does it matter if they are really useful in the end? What is really useful in the end? It's irrelevant. Magic can aid a Christian now so it is useful to him/her now. The end is always changing; it doesn't matter. Magic has advantages that Christianity doesn't have, though they arrive in the same place. Ergo, magic would be useful for a particular type of Christian looking for something which is not immediately offered to him by Christianity.

Namaste

Logged

Trillis

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1099

The Happy Magician.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #36 on: June 16, 2007, 10:21:29 AM »

I enjoyed the article immensely. Thank you.

Logged

Metatron

New Member

*

Posts: 19

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #37 on: June 16, 2007, 05:28:38 PM »

I am personally not in a position to speak on behalf of what Magick is or is not compatible with, however I should note that I came to this board not so long ago myself facing the same question. And I can only give this advice to you, your question would best be directed towards god, pray to him and await an answer.

This is an answer only god can give to you and while everyone may in fact have good intentions and mean to be helpful there is only one who can give you the true answer you seek.

Logged

Let's understand each other I sang the first hymn when the stars were born. Not that long ago, I announced to a young woman, Mary, who it was she was expecting. On the other hand, I've turned rivers into blood. Kings into cripples. Cities to salt. I don't think that I have to explain myself -Gabriel

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #38 on: June 16, 2007, 06:51:52 PM »

Well, if it's just my interpretations, then name one meaningful thing that can be gained through magic that cannot be gained through adhering to the teachings of Christ.

Also, you can throw the word "interpretation" at me as many times as you want, but you are the one who said that the Torah was written by God through automatic writing, and then you go ahead and disregard it whenever it directly and obviously opposes what you want to believe. So I think I'm not in a worse boat than you because I actually trust in what I believe God has said (and I don't see a reason to trust in magic when God has not said anything about it, despite your qabalistic interpretations.). I have quoted the bible to uphold "my" position (actually, it is the bible's position which I have taken on, so credit goes to God) whereas you have taught the teachings of men in an effort to pervert that which God has declared.

Christians have greater things to look forward to than anything magic can give.

~Steve

Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #39 on: June 16, 2007, 08:16:19 PM »

Quote from: Steve

Well, if it's just my interpretations, then name one meaningful thing that can be gained through magic that cannot be gained through adhering to the teachings of Christ.

No, Steve, this is totally irrelevant to the argument at hand and has not been implied anywhere before. Besides, this has already been covered. I'll say it again:

Each path has its advantages and disadvantages.

None is better than the other. It depends on the individual.

Quote from: Steve

Also, you can throw the word "interpretation" at me as many times as you want, but you are the one who said that the Torah was written by God through automatic writing, and then you go ahead and disregard it whenever it directly and obviously opposes what you want to believe. So I think I'm not in a worse boat than you because I actually trust in what I believe God has said (and I don't see a reason to trust in magic when God has not said anything about it, despite your qabalistic interpretations.). I have quoted the bible to uphold "my" position (actually, it is the bible's position which I have taken on, so credit goes to God) whereas you have taught the teachings of men in an effort to pervert that which God has declared.

1. The way I argue, and whether or not I am hypocritical, is not the matter at hand. The point is, your arguments don't work in this case.

2. Yes, I did say that about the Torah. However, I wasn't using that as direct evidence of anything, I mentioned it in passing as an example. You're quoting directly from the Bible as if it immediately proves anything at all...

3. God has never said anything about cars; do you not see a reason to trust in them to get you from point A to point B? God has never said anything about the theory of

evolution; should we not trust in that too? God has never said anything about the lightbulb, yet can you deny that electricity is produced from it? This is a logical fallacy. Just because God does not choose to comment on something does not make it any less trustworthy.

4. My interpretations are, again, totally irrelevant. Your's are the ones being discussed here, and we are not using them in comparison to mine. Whether or not I do anything in my arguments doesn't suddenly make my points any less valid.

5. No, credit goes to the author of the bible, and even then, he may have a different interpretation than you. You are now acting (or insinuating) that we are all wrong just because you're using the word of God from a book not even written directly by Him. Logical fallacy.

6. Quoting the Bible doesn't work. I've explained this repeatedly. If you wouldn't use it as proof in front of an atheist audience, don't use it in front of anyone but people who have the same interpretation as you.

7. That last sentence there is highly dramatic; it almost sounds as if you are on a crusade to defend God. I am attacking your arguments Steve, not because they are not intelligent, but because in the current forum and context, they don't work. The Bible isn't a credible resource to every single person, as say, chlorofluorocarbons are to damaging the ozone layer and helping Global Warming.

8. ...I'm trying to "pervert the word of God?" Please, now this is just not related at all. Now you're not even being sensible. Just accept that your arguments don't work on a forum with more than one religion. First of all, you're not definitely teaching the word of God, this is what you believe. And secondly, I'm not trying to "pervert" anything, let alone the word of God. Where in the world did you get this from?

9. For the umpteenth time, not everyone believes as you do, so just about every point you're making is subjective. Even your accusations. An atheist would just laugh at you if you tried to use the Bible in an argument against him. A person from another religion would start using their own scripture.

10. The Bible, for all the evidence we have, was written by man, and man is not God. God did not make the Bible magically appear in the middle of a desert for his people to read and glean divine understanding from.

11. What makes the Bible any better than the Quran, or some other sacred scripture? Why, because it says Jesus is Lord, or the son of God? Last time I checked, it seemed the Quran stated that Muhammed was the last and greatest prophet of Allah (who is technically the same God being worshiped as YHVH). I don't see how the Bible is any better than any other religious scripture, but if you do, this is your own belief, which is automatically subjective in an argument. Therefore, trying to use it as evidence is a logical fallacy (yet again).

Quote from: Steve

Christians have greater things to look forward to than anything magic can give.

1. Oh? Do they now? Well, I'm sure most magicians would disagree with you and say magic is a much more worthwhile cause.
2. Can you back this up with proof other than the Bible?
3. This is a somewhat egotistical statement, or at least that is implied through reading it. I, and other people have already explained to you why magic can give things which Christianity does not. You seem to simply not be accepting it, though we have used logic in giving you an answer. So, I ask you: is there any point in repeatedly asking if we repeatedly answer and you repeatedly rebuke logical answers? And is there any answer you will accept? Or any manner in which it is presented?
4. This is a purely subjective statement.
5. Based on what has been said earlier, it is reasonable to assume that it is also erroneous.
6. Every year, hundreds of people climb up Mt. Fiji. They use many different roads, and many different paths, but when they finally reach the summit, it matters not how they arrived there. Meditate on that. It is much more logical than any of your "Christianity is superior to magic" statements (which is the attitude you are projecting even if you're being covert and not saying it "directly.").

Lastly, Steve, I'd like to say that I apologize if I am offending you, but I encourage you to stop before you rebuke my arguments yet again and think about what I have said, and look at your own arguments intelligently. They do not make sense to anyone but who believes in the same way you do. I will personally say I hold the Bible in the same light (or at least, a similar one) as you, but I would never argue as you are currently, because I know that most people will not accept my words, and I will be making an argument which does not work objectively. Therefore, I am not attacking you, your beliefs, or trying to "pervert" God or His word, but I am bringing to light the various issues in your arguments.

Read also, the longest post I have made so far yet again, particularly the part about the diversity and advantages and disadvantages of each path. The usefulness of a path depends entirely on the individual walking it, and no road is a universal gateway to salvation.

Namaste

« Last Edit: June 16, 2007, 08:19:56 PM by Oriens LvX Lucis »

Logged

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #40 on: June 17, 2007, 09:11:14 AM »

If you can't name even one thing that a person can benefit from through magic that is not already found in Jesus, then how can you say magic is a worthwhile endeavor for those who already follow Christ? This is not beside the point, this is my point.

"3. God has never said anything about cars; do you not see a reason to trust in them to get you from point A to point B? God has never said anything about the theory of evolution; should we not trust in that too? God has never said anything about the lightbulb, yet can you deny that electricity is produced from it? This is a logical fallacy. Just because God does not choose to comment on something does not make it any less trustworthy." See, the problem with this logic is that God did comment on magic, and said not to do a bunch of stuff. Reading and studying the bible is required to know what God said "do not do" regarding. Anything beyond those things are indeed like the car, but first one must learn what God has forbidden before you go around saying He hasn't forbidden anything.

Regardless, my point in this thread isn't whether magic is allowed or not, but simply that it's not needed in the Christian's life.

"4. My interpretations are, again, totally irrelevant. Your's are the ones being discussed here, and we are not using them in comparison to mine. Whether or not I do anything in my arguments doesn't suddenly make my points any less valid." If you're using what I claim are "your interpretations" to try and counter what you claim are "my interpretations" then they are very much relevant.

"6. Quoting the Bible doesn't work. I've explained this repeatedly. If you wouldn't use it as proof in front of an atheist audience, don't use it in front of anyone but people who have the same interpretation as you." If quoting the bible will not work, then you have shown a disregard for the words of God and it's no wonder you will not listen. I did not quote the bible uselessly, but to show you what God and Jesus and the apostles had to say on the issues back then. I especially quoted Isaiah in my sig the one time because you are not listening.

The bible is the original knowledge of God's acts and words from Judaism; I do use it when talking to Atheists about God, and to jump forward to point number 11 of this section and 2 of the next section, I also back up my understanding through study and experiences. God Himself is the one who turned me to the bible, who quoted from it to tell me His word directly (even in regard to some issues I'd never known anything about)

and who acted like the "God of the bible". It is God who revealed His Christ, Jesus, to me. That is why I believe the bible and will quote from it.

"because I know that most people will not accept my words" My words are my words, and let them be ignored if people don't care. But the Words of the Lord bring life and hope, and they are a different matter entirely. If I will not teach people who are willing to learn about the Lord (and since this thread is directed at Christians, I have some lee-way to do this here) then of what use am I to Him? As Paul, I believe, says those who accept Jesus but do not go out and do in love what Jesus taught are like people running out of a burning house; they will escape the fire but only as one barely escaping the flames.

I have explained to others who have used the bible in discussions with people who don't believe in the bible that those people do not have to automatically accept what the bible has to say, because they were getting frustrated with people not believing, but I don't think I've discouraged them from using the bible when talking to them.

"no road is a universal gateway to salvation." Jesus is a universal pathway.

Acts2:38Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. 39The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call."

Matthew 28:16Then the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had told them to go. 17When they saw him, they worshiped him; but some doubted. 18Then Jesus came to them and said, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. 19Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in[a] the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 20and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age."

Matthew 25:31-46

This is why I quote the bible. You say one thing, the people in the bible say another thing. I am giving arguments that other people have already given, and with more authority than you or I have on the matter. Believe me or not, as you will, but do not so lightly discount what has been said by those with authority from God.

~Steve

I will call upon the Lord,
Who is worthy to be praised.
So shall I be saved from my enemies.

The Lord liveth, and blessed be the Rock,
and let the God of my salvation be exalted!

The Lord liveth, and blessed be the Rock,
and let the God of my salvation be exalted!

I will call upon the Lord.

(a song, not a quote from the bible)

« Last Edit: June 17, 2007, 09:43:39 AM by Steve » Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #41 on: June 17, 2007, 10:14:44 AM »

They can, of course, be incompatible. However, in general there is no problem. It's one of those "purifying you by fire" type of things, but since we're all already here...

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766

[View Profile](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #42 on: June 17, 2007, 10:33:07 AM »

Steve, I've never been arguing whether or not anyone needs magic. The truth is, they don't. There are many other paths for them to choose from, and none of them are necessary. Any one of them is just as important and fulfilling as another one.

Quote from: Steve

The bible is the original knowledge of God's acts and words from Judaism; I do use it when talking to Atheists about God, and to jump forward to point number 11 of this section and 2 of the next section, I also back up my understanding through study and experiences. God Himself is the one who turned me to the bible, who quoted from it to tell me His word directly (even in regard to some issues I'd never known anything about) and who acted like the "God of the bible". It is God who revealed His Christ, Jesus, to me. That is why I believe the bible and will quote from it.

You have the full right to use the Bible in an argument, but I'm telling you, most people will just dismiss it and not use it as actual evidence. As for everything else you said in this paragraph; it is implied that God has led you to a place, yet this is your belief, one which cannot be proven, and one which is therefore completely subjective until proven otherwise. You keep trying to prove, or at least explain/augment subjective statements with more beliefs and subjective statements. It's proof anymore, it's just you talking about what you personally believe.

Quote from: Steve
Jesus is a universal pathway.

Yet another subjective statement. Tell this to Buddhists; they acknowledge all other genuine paths but they also acknowledge that no path is universal and that different people are suited to different paths. Can you prove this? If not, then there is no point in saying it in an argument; it is automatically disposable.

Quote from: Steve
This is why I quote the bible. You say one thing, the people in the bible say another thing. I am giving arguments that other people have already given, and with more authority than you or I have on the matter. Believe me or not, as you will, but do not so lightly discount what has been said by those with authority from God.

Subjective statements again. If you cannot prove these things, they have no place in a logical, organized, and well presented argument except to state your beliefs.

Steve, you're no longer arguing. You're just stating what you believe and why you are right because you are following God's word (which, in of itself, cannot be proven and is yet another subjective statement). In order to actually argue, you must prove what you are saying, or at least use an objectively true argument. Sure, you may use the Bible with atheists, but they most likely do not believe you at all. In their eyes, you are just another raving Christian who uses Variable A to prove Variable B, without first defining and proving Variable B, as shown in the following example:

Statement 1: The Bible is God's word.

Statement 2: The Bible is the ultimate authority in an argument because it was made by God.

Statement 3: Thus, I have in my argument more authority on what is true and correct than you do.

This would be a logical truth, were Statement 1 ever actually proved. This is the usual pattern in religious arguments; the first premise is taken as absolute truth without ever proving it objectively. Examine your argument and apply this example to it.

Namaste
Logged
Raitaro
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable
« Reply #43 on: June 17, 2007, 10:42:50 AM »
I agree with Steve. Everything found in magic can be gained by humbling yourself before the Lord, however, that's not as simple as the average preist or devout Christian will have you believe. Through magic, I have come to know the Lord and it allowed me to do as Steve said.
Logged
The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.
I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....
Wonderland
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Christianity and Magick are Compatable

« Reply #44 on: June 17, 2007, 11:14:56 AM »

Oriens, there is no doubt as to your learning or your devotion. However, I think perhaps Steve is having an experience wherein he is still somewhat blinded by the light and he is going with what he knows. Clearly, he has a lot of knowledge of the verses of the Bible.

The word "Bible" was as close of an English translation as they could come up with for "book" in Greek. I wonder if we are ready to know more about this yet. It would need to be a new thread. But it's sort of like the Alpha (dog's) Bet, if you will.

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 8 [Print](#)

[« previous](#) [next »](#)

Jump to:

=> [Magick](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=7781.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

18

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 18, 2014, 02:11:40 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

[Advanced search](#)

215001 Posts in 15323 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most online today: 123 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ The church 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 Print

Author Topic: The church (Read 4371 times)

DarkWaterMoon

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 589

Karma: -2

Has a lot of posts

[View Profile](#)

The church

« on: March 04, 2006, 05:44:14 PM »

After reading "The Scarlet Letter" a few ideas have seemed to dawn on me. Why is it that people, espically women, say they love God with all their heart and go to church every week. But these same people are NOT Christian like at all. For example, this one woman I know constantly gives attitude to ppl in class and thinks she is better than everyone; saying how ppl suck at sports and she is better. Why are ppl so hipocritical?

Logged

Adept

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1145

Karma: 4

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #1 on: March 04, 2006, 06:11:08 PM »

Because people are stupid. Its a WELL documented fact...>_>

Logged

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #2 on: March 04, 2006, 08:05:04 PM »

The seven deadly sins

1. Pride
2. Envy
3. Gluttony
4. Lust
5. Anger
6. Greed
7. Sloth

If they are right, it's going to funny as hell (pun intended)

Logged

Sigil for focus

Best argument ever.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #3 on: March 05, 2006, 02:06:42 AM »

Quote from: DarkWaterMoon on March 04, 2006, 05:44:14 PM

After reading "The Scarlet Letter" a few ideas have seemed to dawn on me. Why is it that people, espically women, say they love God with all their heart and go to church every week. But these same people are NOT Christian like at all. For example, this one woman I know constantly gives attitude to ppl in class and thinks she is better than everyone; saying how ppl suck at sports and she is better. Why are ppl so hipocritical?

Many people call themselves Christian who have either not read, or not understood, the teachings of Matthew 7. Many verses within that chapter apply to your question, but in particular:

Quote from: Matthew 7

21"Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. 22Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name drive out demons and perform many miracles?' 23Then I will tell them plainly, 'I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!'

Read the rest of the chapter for context.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

AngryLeprachaun

Freelance Leprechaun

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 555

Karma: -1

VERITAS LEP

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #4 on: March 05, 2006, 09:41:23 AM »

Exact thing happened to me. We were having a party because we all passed our finals last semester. This girl came up to me and said, "If you don't bring any food to eat for the class, you will starve." I just don't know why individuals will go to these extreme lengths to feel better about themselves. Maybe a more powerful being than everyone else? No one is perfect.....except maybe me. grin

Logged

...:Believe:...

NathanE

BEEFCAKE BEEFCAKE

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 554

Karma: 17

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #5 on: March 05, 2006, 04:35:34 PM »

Quote from: TakeV on March 04, 2006, 08:05:04 PM

The seven deadly sins

1. Pride
2. Envy
3. Gluttony
4. Lust
5. Anger
6. Greed
7. Sloth

If they are right, it's going to be funny as hell (pun intended)

Okies got 3,6,7 down just 4 more to go :-P

Logged

Chance is a word void of sense; nothing can exist without a cause. ~Voltaire

Engineers like to solve problems. If there are no problems handily available, they will create their own problems.~Scott Adams

“Mechanical Engineers build weapons, Civil Engineers build targets”

Rafnul!
he-who-posts-lots
Veritas Moderator
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1081
Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church
« Reply #6 on: March 05, 2006, 07:51:21 PM »

The Reason why I hate school, and the reason why I hate most people who call themselves Christians are tied into a similar recurring portion of my past. In my case, I attended religious education with the most popular students in my school. Class was little more than an excuse to talk about what had happened on Saturday night (usually involving alcoholism or sexual indulgence[we're talking ages 9-14 here]). I mean, that bothered me a little, but that's just life, I suppose. What bugged me was that the same stupid shit that happened in school, this one girl that always got picked on... like not just picked on, but seriously treated as if she were not a human... they just toyed with her, and that happened every week in religious ed, and every day at school for almost 6 years. Those kids called themselves Christians and they got treated like they were the cream of the crop by adults. Myself, and all of my non church-going friends were always the target of authority in our school. No matter what bad happened, we were the first to be accused no matter what. Those popular kids from religious education class? I don't think they ever got in trouble for anything they did. Always put on their fake shiny faces for the adults... what a load of shit.

That's the sad truth of the situation I realized only when I got older. All those adults who were in positions of authority had been just like the kids in my religious ed class when they were younger. So I gave up on school. It was never about learning... it was about perpetuating a society that I had come to loathe and hate for it's absolutely insatiable desire to put down the selfless and raise up the most selfish manipulative people it could find.

When I got older, that made me even stop believing in God. In my mind, even though I stood out in my religious ed class, as the only student to never answer a question incorrectly, as the only student to sit next to and talk to the girl everyone else abused... as the only one to tell everyone else to shut the fuck up, I was persecuted. But after fusing some thoughts from my present with the memories of my past, I've come to realize the truth. Really BEING Christian is a dangerous thing. There's nothing safe about putting your reputation, status, sanity, or even life on the line for the sake of what

you believe in. IT's probably the most dangerous thing a person can do, really. For a while I didn't think the danger was worth it, I didn't think I'd been able to do anything at all. A few voices changed everything for me though. Because you know, even if I change just one... that's enough reason to risk it all, right?

I know this isn't what your topic was really about, but chances are if you are asking this question, you'll understand what I had to say. Just remember, never give up on the good fight, because any results are good results.

Logged
DarkWaterMoon
Has a lot of posts
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 589
Karma: -2

Has a lot of posts

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church
« Reply #7 on: March 05, 2006, 08:15:38 PM »
Quote from: Rafnul on March 05, 2006, 07:51:21 PM
I know this isn't what your topic was really about, but chances are if you are asking this question, you'll understand what I had to say. Just remember, never give up on the good fight, because any results are good results.

Ofcourse, I always try to do something nice for somebody, even if it means sacrificing alittle from myself. You don't have to be Christian to be a good person.

Logged
Rawiri
Wandering Nomad
Veritas Teacher
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 918
Karma: 42

[Veritas Teacher](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #8 on: March 05, 2006, 10:17:14 PM »

All of the problems are really based in "I." It is not the fault of christian religion itself but the people who call themselves christians, though as kobok pointed out, most hardly even read the bible nor understand it, they just follow along with what others say.

Many "christians" believe that if you don't accept christ as your saviour, you are not freed of your sins and are going to go to hell. For example, they say homosexuals cannot go to heaven, because they are sinning and cannot be saved unless they become heterosexual. They say by accepting christ as their saviour they are forgiven of their previous sins, yet behold! They sin some more, a great deal of the population is adulterers, getting divorced and then remarrying etc, yet they are allowed to be adulterers, but people are not allowed to be gay? Christ hung upon the cross to free all people of all sins, it was not, "follow me and you will be freed of sins."

The ideas are based purely on that by accepting christ, they are better than others. Even than ones who diligently work towards not sinning, but just happen to be homosexual or of another religion etc. As is said in the bible "remove the plank from your own eyes, before removing the chip in your brothers" (though I don't think it's "chip"..but I'm at school and so can't be bothered to search). It resides around the idea of death ultimately, nothing wants to die as such. The little egos and vices want to be free and sprout, so, they hide themselves from the person, but due to seperation and superiority, others find them and point them out, though you can't see your own so easy (for most people).

Logged
kobok
Veritas Council
Tech Team
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4891
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #9 on: March 06, 2006, 09:45:55 AM »

Quote from: Rafnul on March 05, 2006, 07:51:21 PM

Those kids called themselves Christians and they got treated like they were the cream of the crop by adults. Myself, and all of my non church-going friends were always the target of authority in our school. No matter what bad happened, we were the first to be accused no matter what. Those popular kids from religious education class? I don't think they ever got in trouble for anything they did. Always put on their fake shiny faces for the adults... what a load of shit.

That reminds me of something similar. Once in October of 2004, I heard a 7 year old girl talking about the presidential election, and someone asked her who she wanted to win. I heard her say, "Bush," and then she was asked why. Then I heard her say, "Because he's a better Christian."

This is a fairly widespread problem of the superficial appearance of authenticity being more important to people than an objective assessment of action. This mindset is planted at a very early age, and it affects us at many levels.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #10 on: March 07, 2006, 08:07:55 PM »

Point conceded, kobok. Wink

Logged

Murray

Veritas Furniture

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 379

Karma: -1

Pull my finger, I'm an Aikidoka

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #11 on: March 08, 2006, 08:04:12 AM »

Rafnul, that first post made you one of the very few christians I respect. Why?

Because you truly embrace what Jesus said, and that is extremely rare.

Logged

"A dream where I slowly suck out a clown's vital organs with a hoover is a GOOD DREAM!"

- Darkduck

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #12 on: March 08, 2006, 09:33:38 PM »

Quote

Because you truly embrace what Jesus said, and that is extremely rare.

I thought that was actually one of their 10 commandments:

Thou shalt not follow our teachings.

=P

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #13 on: March 20, 2006, 04:53:48 PM »

Well I'm not gonna pretend like I have anything worthwhile to say...

But I do have some questions if it's okay, if not please feel free to insult me ^^ . OKay here goes, I like to think of myself as a Christian but a HORRIBLE Christian.. I try pretty hard but still I can't keep myself to godly ways, so I think I'm pathetic because I'm not able to devote myself entirely to a goal of following Christ (despite it's importance)...

I'm really bad.. can't even forgive certain small misdeeds and linger on the past. Actually that's a bit of why I joined Veritas, a sort of hope that some self mastery would help me to be being a better healthier person.

Hmm, in the interest of not making a totally selfish post of my complaints, would you consider this difficulty a key factor in play amongst these hypocritical christians?

Sorry for my selfish post

Apricot

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Yoda

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 140

Karma: 0

Noite de demônio

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #14 on: March 20, 2006, 05:18:45 PM »

Quote from: TakeV on March 04, 2006, 08:05:04 PM

The seven deadly sins

1. Pride

2. Envy
3. Gluttony
4. Lust
5. Anger
6. Greed
7. Sloth

If they are right, it's going to be funny as hell (pun intended)
I have all 7 down pat...

Logged

Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes?

Who Will Guard The Guards?

Vincit Qui Si Vincit.

He Conquers Who Conquers Himself.

Neca Eos Omnes. Dues Suos Agnoscet.

Kill Them all. God Will Know His Own.

Force a hand and it will fight you. But convince a mind to think as you want it to think,
and you have an ally.

Pages: [1] 2 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple
Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C7781.15.html>

1 capture

7 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 12:13:55 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

166543 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ The church 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author Topic: The church (Read 2232 times)

DarkWaterMoon

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 583

Has a lot of posts

View Profile

Re: The church

« Reply #15 on: March 20, 2006, 05:30:18 PM »

Quote from: Apricot on March 20, 2006, 04:53:48 PM

Well I'm not gonna pretend like I have anything worthwhile to say...

But I do have some questions if it's okay, if not please feel free to insult me ^^ . OKay here goes, I like to think of myself as a Christian but a HORRIBLE Christian.. I try pretty hard but still I can't keep myself to godly ways, so I think I'm pathetic because I'm not able to devote myself entirely to a goal of following Christ (despite it's importance)...

I'm really bad.. can't even forgive certain small misdeeds and linger on the past. Actually that's a bit of why I joined Veritas, a sort of hope that some self mastery would help me to be being a better healthier person.

You will never be able to become equal to the doings of Christ. Why? Because you are human and you are made to make mistakes and sin; it's the nature of man. It is this reason, or so they say, that Christ died for us because he knew we couldn't help our nature but wanted us to be absolved(spelling) of our sin. He knew the nature of his people would be to fear the unknown and that they would kill him, yet he accepted this

term. If he had not known his fate, he would have run for a fearful man does not die willingly.

Quote

Hmm, in the interest of not making a totally selfish post of my complaints, would you consider this difficulty a key factor in play amongst these hypocritical christians?

Sorry for my selfish post
Apricot

Hipocrisy is dissolved once one realizes that he does not have the power to become like Christ. When one realizes this, lets the belief of being perfect go, and respect the fact that one will sin, then you will break free from hipocrisy. However, by no means should you not do acts of good when you can!

And don't be sorry.

Logged
Apricot
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #16 on: March 20, 2006, 05:39:52 PM »

I'm not quite foolish enough to try and be equal to Christ, I meant that I fail in just simple christian things.. Probably all of the seven deadly sins, and many more.

I think that's the hardest part for me is that the seven sins are human nature to me... Well I'll shut up now because my words aren't fitting together nicely.

Thanks for the kind words though

Logged
Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?
Yoda
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 140

Noite de demônio

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #17 on: March 20, 2006, 05:45:10 PM »

Apricot, it's human nature period to be selfish, greedy, lazy, lustful, angry, proud
gluttonous people, the bible just tries to make people defy what is in their nature, it's like
making a polar bear eat vegetarian (love chilly beach)

Logged

Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes?

Who Will Guard The Guards?

Vincit Qui Si Vincit.

He Conquers Who Conquers Himself.

Neca Eos Omnes. Dues Suos Agnoscet.

Kill Them all. God Will Know His Own.

Force a hand and it will fight you. But convince a mind to think as you want it to think,
and you have an ally.

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #18 on: March 20, 2006, 05:51:22 PM »

I think it's more to overcome the negative sides of our natures.

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Yoda

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 140

Noite de demônio

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #19 on: March 20, 2006, 05:53:29 PM »

Defy, overcome, same difference, except one makes those qualities seem negative and one makes them seem positive, personally, i choose defy

Logged

Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes?

Who Will Guard The Guards?

Vincit Qui Si Vincit.

He Conquers Who Conquers Himself.

Neca Eos Omnes. Dues Suos Agnoscet.

Kill Them all. God Will Know His Own.

Force a hand and it will fight you. But convince a mind to think as you want it to think, and you have an ally.

Agent47

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 55

Jujubeans 'n such

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #20 on: March 20, 2006, 05:55:23 PM »

The bible tries to get people to defy traits such as gluttony, pride, anger, etc, in favor of traits like contentment, humility, peace, and love. Other books teach to defy love and peace and humility in favor of their opposites. Some would say the bible attempts to get people to strengthen their "positive" traits, while repressing their "negative" traits. It all depends on your point of view.

Logged

Don't ask, just know.

Then again, to ask is to know....

Or is it the other way around?

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 989

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #21 on: March 21, 2006, 12:06:06 AM »

Let me just clarify that the "Seven Deadly Sins" are not Biblical in origin. I suggest <http://www.whitestonejournal.com/seven/> For further reading.

Logged

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #22 on: March 21, 2006, 07:28:44 AM »

I hope I can do a quote right, here goes

Quote

The history of this list goes back at least to Pope St. Gregory the Great and St. John Cassian, but while the list itself is not strictly biblical, the Bible proscribes all seven

I think these 7 sins are a really good guideline to try to follow. The website was also very nice, and I thank you for it.

I'm going to eventually write up a schedule to try to live a bit of a better life this way.. That is once I overcome sloth and get to writing that schedule ^^;

Anyhow, I will now return to failing physics

Apricot

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 989

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #23 on: March 21, 2006, 12:55:21 PM »

Apricot, if this is your goal I strong suggest reading

http://www.ftrain.com/franklin_improving_self.html. I was introduced to this when I was in high school, and I found it very intriguing.

Logged

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #24 on: March 21, 2006, 01:01:12 PM »

Thanks I've already that, I agree it was rather inspritational ^^ I've taken to keeping a log to track myself also.

I should thank you again for being so very helpful

Apricot

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1456

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #25 on: March 22, 2006, 01:38:56 AM »

Rafnul, what you said was genius back there. I totally agree that being truly Christian is dangerous, and perhaps it's a good thing that no one can truly be exactly like Christ in matters of perfection.

but I still think it's funny and rather sickening that more wars and personal battles have been in the name of Christ than in the names of hitler, mussolini, stalin, or lenin.

anyway, Darkwatermoon, I grew up in a heavily Christian, Mormon, community. and I didn't mind it until about a year ago, the end of my senior year in high school, when I started noticing the pathetic behavior of most of the people I knew. they're all homophobic, racist crazyheads that think they're the shit. I wasn't allowed to do most ceremonial church activities like sacrament and the like because my hair was too long and I didn't shave. Yeah, I had a full beard and hair past my ears, but no matter how well I behaved, I was not good enough for "God." and the really sad thing is, I KNOW what those other guys at church were like, and they could do whatever they wanted (ceremonially speaking) because they "repented" and promised never to commit those sins again. yeah, maybe they were really trying their best and deserved to continue in church, but so was I. anyway, I don't blame them, I blame the church leaders who base all their judgement on physical appearance.

so basically I don't go to church anymore, and I've been looking into Taoism and self improvement.

« Last Edit: March 22, 2006, 01:47:10 AM by Martial Thoughts » Logged
Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

SethLaRoth DeShawl

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 877

[View Profile](#)

Re: The church

« Reply #26 on: March 24, 2006, 07:23:06 AM »

check this out www.skepticannotatedbible.com not only does it have the KJV in its entirety but it also points out many of the contradictions, although many of those suck it does have a great deal of good ones.

and if anyone wants to here it i and a friend of mine came up with five valid points to say jesus is a vampire.

Logged

sethlaroth_deshawl@dragonmount.com

Pages: 1 [2] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=10924.0>

8 captures

4 Aug 2007 - 21 Feb 2017

Oct FEB Mar

21

2015 2017 2018

About this capture

The Veritas Society

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Main Page

Forums

Chat

Help

Search

Calendar

Login

Register

The Veritas Society »Discussion Areas »Magick »God

« previous next »

Print

Pages: [1] 2 3

Author Topic: God (Read 6826 times)

0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

July 25, 2007, 09:31:10 AMRead 6826 times

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

View Profile

God

Hi. I met a guy the other day and we discussed some topics that were new to me and he told me about this site and told me to check it out so here I am.

Our discussion mainly focused on two subjects and if/how they are tied together. He was reading a book that I can best explain as being about out of body experiences and he was researching interacting with things/people in the midst of one of these experiences. The other subject was God and if and how the two are tied together.

So that is the question that I would like to present in this topic: Do the things discussed in this forum tie back to God? And if so, how?

Thanks.

Logged

July 25, 2007, 09:35:20 AMReply #1

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

Offline

2151

Karma:

0

Personal Text

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: God

Many things in this forum tie back to God. Your relationship with God is a highly personal thing so don't expect articles about it, however there are many threads on morality, spirituality and exercises which promote closeness to God. You will probably find (if you go into the chat, click the chat button or if you have mIRC irc.sorcery.net #vsociety) plenty of people willing to discuss what they think about God and how they know him.

:)

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles

are all fucked up.....

July 25, 2007, 10:11:26 AMReply #2

Kichara

Posts By Osmosis

Offline

982

Karma:

16

Personal Text

Row, Row, Row Your Boat

View Profile Check it Out.

Re: God

In case you were interested in looking into that book, it was Astral Dynamics by Robert Bruce.

Also, Welcome :)

Namaste

Logged

Hey, whats up?

Please vote in my poll:

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=12212.0>

July 25, 2007, 12:15:21 PMReply #3

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

View Profile

Re: God

Thanks for your input Raitaro. I guess that your view of how God ties into something would depend a lot on your view of God.

I am a Christian and, although my relationship with God is very personal, I know that there is also a very public side to my faith as well. Jesus has changed my life in a way that is noticeable to those around me and so I guess I should be more specific with my question in order to get input that will be meaningful to me.

How do people here view Jesus and how does your view of Him effect your beliefs about the topics that are discussed here?

Thanks for your insight.

Logged
July 25, 2007, 01:21:00 PMReply #4
Raitaro
Posts By Osmosis

Offline

2151

Karma:

0

Personal Text

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: God

Naturally, your view of Jesus will effect what you read here. A lot of people here take Jesus as an example of a Magician and use what he says to verify their beliefs (generally on how ethical preforming magic is).

Logged
The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

July 25, 2007, 01:25:23 PMReply #5
cyokley
New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

View Profile

Re: God

Interesting. Where does Jesus use magic or talk about magic?

Logged
July 25, 2007, 03:12:45 PMReply #6

Prophecy
Teacher Emeritus
Posts By Osmosis

Offline

Theurgist

1237

Karma:

79

Personal Text

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Quote

Where does Jesus use magic or talk about magic?

Both of those questions are highly debatable. Naturally to a magician, who can produce similar if not identical phenomena to what Jesus produced, it is difficult to tell what could have been magic and what may have simply been the work of God. To a Christian, who believes entirely in the divinity of Christ, then no doubt it would all be miracles. Could Jesus have used magic to have done the things he did? Yes. Could he have done it all without magic and through divine grace alone? Yes. It is left to the discretion of the viewer in this case. What is certain however is that Jesus did things which appear to be miraculous, and in the process provided a code of honor to live by and teachings to understand. Magicians likewise often do things which people consider to be "miraculous," and I myself have even received letters and emails from people who try to call me a miracle-worker, when in fact I am simply a magician. Seeing as how both Jesus and magicians work this manner of thing, it seems that the code of conduct which works for one's application of these powers would work just as well for the other's. Many magicians, therefore, adopt the teachings of Jesus in regard to life, if not necessarily in regard to religion (though a great number of magicians have Christian tendencies). Here are some of the verses of interest to magicians, and why:

Quote from: Matthew 7:6

Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

This is seen as an example of the Law of Silence, one of the codes of the Magi. Essentially it suggests that if you have something precious, such as the higher secrets, you should not give them to those who have not proven themselves.

Quote from: Mark 4:10-12

And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable. And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the

kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.

This is seen also as a verification of the Law of Silence, and also demonstrates that Jesus necessarily exercised discrimination in regards to whom he gave "the mysteries of the Kingdom of God," which as far back as Zoroaster has been a common way of referring to the occult mysteries. It is unlikely that Jesus used it in this exact context, but is an interesting aside.

Quote from: Luke 8:17

For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest; neither any thing hid, that shall not be known and come abroad.

This is also a verse of significance to magicians, though ironically it is often used to negate the law of silence by critics. In truth, it corresponds perfectly to the hermetic teaching that in a coming time there will no longer be "occult secrets," for it shall all be out in the open. Whether or not this time corresponds to the coming of Jesus is a matter of personal conviction.

Quote from: Luke 22:19

And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.

This is an example of the ability of something physical to have an imbued quality that represents something higher, which is a common understanding in magic.

Quote from: Mark 5:30

And Jesus, immediately knowing in himself that virtue had gone out of him, turned him about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes?

The King James Version for some reason often translates the Greek "dunamis" as "virtue." Dunamis is the root from which the English word "dynamic" comes from, and literally means an internal force capable of generating pressure. It is highly unusual to see this in the context of a person, but its meaning is clear: power, and seeing as how the phrasing is "gone out of him," it is by implication an internal dynamic pressure. This is precisely how magicians describe accumulated energy. Likewise, just as Jesus did, a magician instantly knows when this power has gone out from him into another vessel, usually a sick person within the magician's premises. The Weymouth's New Testament Translation provides this verse a little more accurately: "Immediately Jesus, well knowing that healing power had gone from within Him, turned round in the crowd and asked, "Who touched my clothes?" As a note, the usual word for "virtue" is the Greek "arete." No where else in the New Testament is the Greek word "dunamis" translated as power, except for this one time in the King James translation of the Latin Vulgate.

Quote from: Matthew 13:58

And He performed but few mighty deeds there because of their unbelief.

Once again though likely not in the original context, it is a known principle that the disbelief of others can greatly impact the effectiveness of magical operations. Verily many magicians have left a place having only performed "but a few mighty deeds there because of their unbelief."

The magician also necessarily pays attention to any recurring numbers which appear or which he knows to have magical significance, and then Qaballistic understanding is applied to them. This can be done many times through the Bible, most especially to the Old Testament, but by virtue of its inspiration from God this also works particularly well with the Book of Revelations. As an example:

Quote from: Revelations 21:12

And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel.

The Qabalah states that there are twelve walls around the supernal Jerusalem, and these twelve walls are seen in the Tree of Life by the four paths which form a square around Tiphareth combined with the eight paths which connect to it. These are collectively called the "Twelve Borders," and correspond to the twelve tribes, as Revelations also states. What do twelve gates mean? A gate is an entrance to a city, just like a path on the tree of life is an entrance to a sephiroth, in this case Tiphareth. To continue:

Quote from: Revelations 12:14

And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

The sephiroth directly beneath Tiphareth on the Qaballistic Tree of Life is Yesod, and Yesod is literally Hebrew for "Foundation." Naturally, just as the foundation of a building is immediately below it, so Yesod is immediately below Tiphareth as its foundation. Tiphareth reflects its virtues into the world through Yesod, which acts as the intermediary between Tiphareth and Malkuth (our world). These virtues are divided into twelve, for Tiphareth receives its virtues from the twelve gates surrounding it. Therefore we find that Yesod reflects these twelve virtues, but in a way more relevant to the world. Seeing as how the Twelve Tribes were of a more celestial time, and the advent of Jesus Christ necessarily established a new order, it is only fitting that the names of the twelve tribes would be around the borders of Tiphareth itself, but that it would be the names of the twelve disciples upon Yesod, which is closer to our physical world.

I could continue on about only the twelve borders of Jerusalem, the golden street which

leads to it on either side, and the river which enters in upon it quite lengthily, but I am simply trying to make an example. How is this all important? The Qabalah is a system of spiritual evolution, and in fact is utilized by many magicians for the sake of understanding certain spiritual laws. While there may in fact be no genuine connection between the Qabalah and the Book of Revelations, even if somehow I have literally "made up" the correlations in that simple analysis of only those two quotes, it still demonstrates that the parallels are intriguing to say the least.

In closing, nowhere in the Bible does it say that Jesus practices magic or that he was a magician of any kind whatsoever. This is not really important to the magician; the manner in which he showed us how to live, however, is important to us (admittedly perhaps not as important or as literal as it would be to a Christian). There are many magicians who consider themselves Christian, and this has never been an obstacle to them. In truth, it has only helped them.

« Last Edit: July 26, 2007, 08:27:10 AM by Prophecy »

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

July 26, 2007, 07:15:53 AMReply #7

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Thanks for the in-depth post Prophecy. Your points are definitely intriguing.

I am curious as to what kinds of things that you do as a magician that lead people to call you a miracle-worker?

The general population sees magic as David Copperfield or a simple act with smoke and mirrors. It is obvious that you are talking about something more than entertainment when you talk about magic.

Logged

July 26, 2007, 08:38:49 AMReply #8

Prophecy

Teacher Emeritus

Posts By Osmosis

Offline

Theurgist

1237

Karma:

79

Personal Text

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Quote

I am curious as to what kinds of things that you do as a magician that lead people to call you a miracle-worker?

Most genuine and practicing magicians have mistakingly been called a miracle worker, though I am not at liberty to say why exactly I have been called such. Suffice it to make a blanket statement: magicians very often work powerful healings on patients who had given up on a hope for recovery.

Now the question may arise, if the magician can do these things, why does he not accept the title "miracle worker"? The answer is that a magician has a clear differentiation between magic and miracles. Through his studies of natural but hidden laws within the universe, he understands that everything he does can actually be perfectly explained using cosmic laws that simply are not known to most of mankind yet. Indeed if he were asked how he did something and felt like sharing the answer, he could explain the entire operation from beginning to end. A miracle, to a magician, is when something happens that denies all known laws and shows a direct interaction between God and His creations thereby. Magic is simply the observation of occult principles; a miracle is the bypassing of natural and occult laws to perform something that should have been impossible. Just as with the religious devotee, a magician can only perform a miracle through intense prayer.

Quote

The general population sees magic as David Copperfield or a simple act with smoke and mirrors. It is obvious that you are talking about something more than entertainment when you talk about magic.

Stage magic was made to mimic real magic, and was created by jugglers who could not understand the occult mysteries, as well as people who simply refused to acknowledge that such powers really exist. When most of the people on this forum refer to "magic," they are referring to an occult science which has existed for at least 5,000 years, and which has been constantly evolving. In the best of ways, this science is a means of personal spiritual evolution and advancement, the training of the mind and soul, the obtainment of true wisdom and understanding, and the mastery of the lower world and its laws. In the worst of circumstances, for there are bad eggs in every bunch, such knowledge can also be used for personal destruction and self indulgence. Regardless of its applications, it is considered an essentially holy study by its students and masters.

Logged
<http://www.thedivinescience.org>
July 26, 2007, 11:25:30 AM Reply #9
cyokley
New Member

Offline
*
8
Karma:
0
[View Profile](#)

Re: God
Prophecy, thanks for taking the time to answer my questions and help me understand more about this subject. Since these ideas are still very new to me I still have a lot of questions. Feel free to stop answering if you get tired of me. :)

Quote from: Prophecy on July 26, 2007, 08:38:49 AM
I am not at liberty to say why exactly I have been called such. Suffice it to make a blanket statement: magicians very often work powerful healings on patients who had given up on a hope for recovery.

What takes away your liberty to talk about the magic you have performed (performed may be a poor word choice)? Is it about humbleness or about casting your pearls before swine or something else?

Quote from: Prophecy on July 26, 2007, 08:38:49 AM
Just as with the religious devotee, a magician can only perform a miracle through intense prayer.

Does this statement mean that all true magicians believe in God? If so do they all believe in the same God? The Christian God? If they don't believe in God then who do they pray to? Or am I misunderstanding the definition of prayer in this statement?

Quote from: Prophecy on July 26, 2007, 08:38:49 AM
In the best of ways, this science is a means of personal spiritual evolution and advancement, the training of the mind and soul, the obtainment of true wisdom and understanding, and the mastery of the lower world and its laws.

What is meant by "mastery of the lower world and its laws" in this statement? Is the "lower world" the world we live in? If so, is there a "higher world"?

Thanks for you time and patients.

Logged
July 26, 2007, 12:59:45 PMReply #10
Prophecy
Teacher Emeritus
Posts By Osmosis

Offline

Theurgist
1237
Karma:
79
Personal Text
Veritas Teacher
View Profile

Re: God

Quote

What takes away your liberty to talk about the magic you have performed (performed may be a poor word choice)? Is it about humbleness or about casting your pearls before swine or something else?

It is important for a magician to remain humble, but seeing as how you are a Christian, I will let Jesus explain it:

"Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly." -Matthew 6:1-4

Quote

Does this statement mean that all true magicians believe in God? If so do they all believe in the same God? The Christian God? If they don't believe in God then who do they pray to? Or am I misunderstanding the definition of prayer in this statement?

Very few magicians are bound by religion, but eventually most magicians come to know and love what is called simply Divine Providence, or simply The Divine, without any need to give a religion-specific name. The prayer, then, would be address simply to Divine Providence, that Absolute Universal force which so many religions have depicted through the ages under varying names and forms.

Quote

What is meant by "mastery of the lower world and its laws" in this statement? Is the

"lower world" the world we live in? If so, is there a "higher world"?

This is the lower world, yes. There are necessarily higher, spiritual worlds. In Judeo-Christian theology, these would be depicted as the seven regions of heaven, though there are many divisions to these main seven that are observed by magicians.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

July 26, 2007, 04:08:34 PMReply #11

Watchtower

Posts By Osmosis

Offline

Hundred-plus Club

935

Karma:

30

Personal Text

Contemplative Panentheist

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist. That is not to say that they do not believe in the existence of so-called "deities," necessarily, but they do not see them in infinite terms. In their view, everything follows a natural law; just because you couldn't explain how a deity did something, does not mean that the deity was overriding natural laws, but rather is an indication that your own knowledge of natural law is incomplete.

Ultimately, the relationship between magic and any idea(s) of "divinity" is entirely dependent on the individual magician and his/her experiences. Many magical systems revolve around divinity, and many don't. From my observations of samples of both schools of thought, they tend to be using many of the same basic principles for their practical magic (i.e. spellcasting to change reality). They are not nearly the same, in practice or theory, but they do share many basic principles.

Logged

"For no matter how holy works may be, they do not make us holy because we do them, but in so far as we within ourselves are as we should be, we make holy all that we do, whether it be eating, or sleeping, or working, or what it may."

-Eckhart von Hochheim

July 27, 2007, 07:44:56 AMReply #12

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Thanks Prophecy. Another question...

Quote from: Prophecy on July 26, 2007, 12:59:45 PM

Very few magicians are bound by religion, but eventually most magicians come to know and love what is called simply Divine Providence, or simply The Divine, without any need to give a religion-specific name. The prayer, then, would be address simply to Divine Providence, that Absolute Universal force which so many religions have depicted through the ages under varying names and forms.

Does this pose a problem? The Bible teaches that there is One God and there is only one way to know God and that is through Jesus. If many different religions point to the same God and there are many different ways to know this God and the Bible says that there is only one God and one way to know Him then doesn't the Bible have to be discounted as a source pointing to God? Or if the Bible is looked at as a collection of books instead of one book then wouldn't we at least have to discount the books in the Bible that were written by authors that claimed One God and one way to know Him?

Thanks for your help in understanding this.

Logged

July 27, 2007, 07:48:25 AMReply #13

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Thanks for your input Watchtower. I have a question about your post also...

Quote from: Watchtower on July 26, 2007, 04:08:34 PM

There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist. That is not to say that they do not believe in the existence of so-called "deities," necessarily, but they do not see them

in infinite terms.

Where do the "deities" that you talk about come from? Who are they?

Thanks.

Logged

July 27, 2007, 07:55:34 AM Reply #14

cyokley

New Member

Offline

*

8

Karma:

0

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

Quote from: Prophecy on July 26, 2007, 08:38:49 AM

Just as with the religious devotee, a magician can only perform a miracle through intense prayer.

Quote from: Watchtower on July 26, 2007, 04:08:34 PM

There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist.

How can both of these views be valid? How can a magician only perform a miracle through intense prayer, but some magicians do not believe in God or Divine Providence at all?

I'm just trying to understand.

Thanks.

Logged

Print

Pages: [1] 2 3

« previous next »

The Veritas Society » Discussion Areas » Magick » God

Jump to:

=> Magick

SMF 2.0.11 | SMF © 2015, Simple Machines

Aqua Style by Diego Andrés

XHTML RSS WAP2

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C10924.15.html>

1 capture
07 Jul 2010
Jun JUL Aug
07
2009 2010 2011

About this capture
The Veritas Society
*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.
Did you miss your activation email?
July 07, 2010, 12:00:41 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length
Search:

Advanced search

166543 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph
Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Discussion Areas

||-+ Magick

|||-+ God 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author Topic: God (Read 1945 times)

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: God

« Reply #15 on: July 27, 2007, 08:03:50 AM »

Nyah, "There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do

not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist."...I've found that almost every serious magician is aware and feels for some form of Divine force, regardless of whether they feel the need to give it a name.

Logged
The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Silver_Archer
Prophet of Doom
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1158

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #16 on: July 27, 2007, 08:13:46 AM »

Quote from: Raitaro on July 27, 2007, 08:03:50 AM

Nyah, "There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist."...I've found that almost every serious magician is aware and feels for some form of Divine force, regardless of whether they feel the need to give it a name.

The person who wrote the message you quoted is a) a magician, and b) a person who, from whatever I have managed to gather of him, does not believe in Divine Providence or 'miracles'.

Thus, it is obvious that there exists at least one magician who does, indeed, not believe in a divine providence or 'miracles.' If one exists, it is logical to assume that others might as well.

Ergo, when you choose to say 'Nyah' to him, either i) You seem to have not paid any attention to what he said, or ii) You do not consider him to be a serious magician.

If it's i) , pay attention. ^ _ ^

If it's ii), that's a pretty big allegation to make about another magician. You sure you want to make it? You sure you ought to be making it?

Logged

MikeWho
Greenhorn
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 206

apathetically inclined.

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #17 on: July 27, 2007, 02:30:31 PM »

if someone is really practicing magic, than they are aware of Divine energy. If it is the other case (disbelief), than it is most likely: a. Spiritual manipulation or
b. psychological illusions

The difference of opinion that the varieties of magicians hold, is usually with the philosophy of the divinity itself. Whether it be one God, several gods, or a spiritual force working through the cosmos, that has no intelligence... what ever the case may be, the mutual understanding is that their is Divinity.

Logged
Raitaro
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2151

The Knight of Wands

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #18 on: July 28, 2007, 05:23:30 AM »

Quote from: Silver_Archer on July 27, 2007, 08:13:46 AM

Quote from: Raitaro on July 27, 2007, 08:03:50 AM

Nyah, "There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist."...I've found that almost every serious magician is aware and feels for some form of Divine force, regardless of wether they feel the need to give it a name.

The person who wrote the message you quoted is a) a magician, and b) a person who,

from whatever I have managed to gather of him, does not believe in Divine Providence or 'miracles'.

Thus, it is obvious that there exists at least one magician who does, indeed, not believe in a divine providence or 'miracles.' If one exists, it is logical to assume that others might as well.

Ergo, when you choose to say 'Nyah' to him, either i) You seem to have not paid any attention to what he said, or ii) You do not consider him to be a serious magician.

If it's i) , pay attention. ^_^

If it's ii), that's a pretty big allegation to make about another magician. You sure you want to make it? You sure you ought to be making it?

Actually, he was referring to "Divine Providence" which if perhaps a "Hermetic phrase" (as it's used by almost every Hermetic magician). I may be mistaken but I'm quite sure he did not say there was no "divine forces" in the universe.

Logged
The IneptInitiate
<http://xkcd.com/303/>
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Steve
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 2096

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #19 on: July 28, 2007, 06:12:25 AM »

"Actually, he was referring to "Divine Providence" which if perhaps a "Hermetic phrase" (as it's used by almost every Hermetic magician). I may be mistaken but I'm quite sure he did not say there was no "divine forces" in the universe."

You are somewhat mistaken for he did indeed declare, and you quoted it, "There are also magicians who do not believe in "Divine Providence," and do not believe that "miracles," as Prophecy has defined them, exist." He did say that he does not believe that the Divine Providence of hermetics exists. Vivi's assessment of your statements was accurate.

Hermetics/Kabalah are not the only magical paths, though in many of the arguments I've had with them they seem to forget this and portray their beliefs as though they are the only magical path (sometimes calling their way the only "True" magical path).

Vivi is trying to point out that there are many views and practices of magic in the world, not just the one/two that hermetics/kabalists follow.

~Steve

« Last Edit: July 28, 2007, 07:32:04 AM by Steve » Logged

Corruption occurs when those who have power, have no strength.

Veos

Veritas Moderator

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 466

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #20 on: July 28, 2007, 10:47:24 AM »

Hmmm.....God and magick. One of the first obvious observations as to why this is always such a heated subject is because many people seem to take both magick and God as being very subjective forces that depend on the individual him or herself. now ultimately if there is a God, then it would have to be objective to some extent, even if it portrayed itself in different ways to different people. Also with magick, although the individual may be affected in different ways by it, since it works with universal law it has to remain largely objective or else the laws wouldn't matter.

Now concerning the relationship between God and the magician, assuming we can simply define a magician as "someone who practices any type of magick", it seems to me that most magicians who claim that there is no single infinite divinity only claim such a thing because they have never experienced it. This can be due to several things: 1)the magician practices a system of magick that would never exalt the mind enough in the first place to experience the divine, 2)general disbelief by the practitioner (though I have witnessed people who have claimed such things and then change their minds when they experienced God), 3) The magician simply doesn't care about such a lofty spiritual achievement (which is usually the case), or 4) They themselves are not effective enough magicians to experience such a thing. In what is generally called "High Magick", the goal is to master the self and fully realize your own soul so that you can carry out the point of spiritual evolution, which is the achievement of "God-Consciousness", Samadhi, Satori, enlightenment, or whatever you may wish to call it. Now people do indeed experience this state of spiritual being, and so to deny

its existence is either the result of disbelief caused by jealousy, or a lack of experience.

Now there are of course magickal systems that don't revolve around such a mystical union. From the perspective of High Magick, these systems are seen as incomplete, although such a statement would of course meet with a harsh response. To such a magician it may indeed seem incomplete, but it is obviously not considered as such by the practitioners of that system, or else they wouldn't be practicing it! Thus there are some systems of magick which focus solely on the Astral realms, such as many of the nordic systems, voodoo, wicca, druidry, celtics, etc...., and its practitioners are completely satisfied with the fruits they reap from their practices.

Also there was a comment made earlier about many systems of magick not focusing on or having a central figure of deity or God. Could you please provide some examples, if there are indeed many? To believe in the existence of deities without a central concept of an infinite creative being is to say that those systems of magick believe that these deities either just popped up one day all at once, or that all of them have just always been. From what I have seen almost all systems of magick, even the pagan branched, revolve around the concept of a core divinity.

Logged

Soham Sivoham Aham Brahma Asmi Mahavakya

Suddha satchitananda purna parabrahma

Chidananda Rupa Sivoham Sivoham

Watchtower

Hundred-plus Club

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 834

Contemplative Pantheist

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #21 on: July 28, 2007, 05:32:30 PM »

A) To me, divinity simply means deity, infinite or not. I do believe deities exist, but I do not believe any of them are omnipotent, omniscient, or any other such absolute, infinite terms. They have limits, some are stronger than others, etc., according to my beliefs.

B)

Quote

now ultimately if there is a God, then it would have to be objective to some extent,

Yes, IF there is a God. The problem, as far as I'm concerned, is I have yet to see that objectively proven. People prove it to themselves all the time, but that is subjective, and is largely based on how the person chooses to interpret what they experience. So, for all intents and purposes, God and Magic ARE subjective forces, because they are defined differently by different individuals, and there is insufficient objective evidence available to set a universal standard for what is "correct."

C)

Quote

it seems to me that most magicians who claim that there is no single infinite divinity only claim such a thing because they have never experienced it.

And it seems to me that most magicians who claim that there is, only claim such a thing because that is how they choose to interpret things that they have felt. I mean, how do you really know for sure that what you felt or saw was infinite? Infinity is a heavy claim, not to be made lightly. Just because someone experiences something that seems infinite from their vantage point, doesn't mean it actually is.

Quote

Now people do indeed experience this state of spiritual being, and so to deny its existence is either the result of disbelief caused by jealousy, or a lack of experience.

People experience something, and then define it as something. We are not saying that their experience didn't happen, we are only suggesting that it may not in fact be what they think it is, which is not an unreasonable position considering what they are claiming it to be.

Quote

From the perspective of High Magick, these systems are seen as incomplete,

And from the perspective of these systems, High Magick may be seen as delusional, although I'm sure that would be met with a harsh response. Obviously, the practitioners of High Magick do not think it is delusional, and they are completely satisfied with the fruits they reap from their practices.

D)

Quote

Also there was a comment made earlier about many systems of magick not focusing on or having a central figure of deity or God. Could you please provide some examples, if there are indeed many?

- 1) Omnimancy
- 2) Rune Magic
- 3) Psionics

- 4) Sympathetic Magic
- 5) Chaos Magic
- 6) Thaumaturgy (which pretty much covers all of the above)

And I'm sure there are many more. Though magic and religion tend to intermingle and affect one another, they are inherently different things. The aforementioned systems of magic do not inherently rely on deity of any kind. The cultures that use these systems may incorporate their religious beliefs into their magic, but on a functional level, the systems themselves can stand alone as magical approaches.

Quote

To believe in the existence of deities without a central concept of an infinite creative being is to say that those systems of magick believe that these deities either just popped up one day all at once, or that all of them have just always been. From what I have seen almost all systems of magick, even the pagan branched, revolve around the concept of a core divinity.

Belief in powerful beings does not imply belief in a supreme being. Some may believe they just popped up, some may believe they were always there, and some may have entirely different ideas about how they came about. Either way, the concept of a single infinite creative being is just one explanation among many. Furthermore, if most of the magic you've seen revolves around the concept of a core divinity, I would wager a guess that you have been exposed primarily to systems of theurgy, which leaves out a vast amount of the magic that is out there. In my experiences, the existence or use of deities in magic is common, however the idea of magic revolving around a single infinite deity is actually a minority. Even in belief systems that do have such an idea, their systems of magic do not necessarily revolve around it. But, we both have to keep in mind that our own experiences are limited, and that there are probably MANY systems of magic out there that we have not been exposed to. This is why I tend to use words like "many," "several," etc. instead of "most," "almost all" etc.

« Last Edit: July 28, 2007, 05:45:21 PM by Watchtower » Logged

"For no matter how holy works may be, they do not make us holy because we do them, but in so far as we within ourselves are as we should be, we make holy all that we do, whether it be eating, or sleeping, or working, or what it may."

-Eckhart von Hochheim

MikeWho

Greenhorn

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 206

apathetically inclined.

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #22 on: July 29, 2007, 04:02:08 PM »

"And it seems to me that most magicians who claim that there is, only claim such a thing because that is how they choose to interpret things that they have felt. I mean, how do you really know for sure that what you felt or saw was infinite? Infinity is a heavy claim, not to be made lightly. Just because someone experiences something that seems infinite from their vantage point, doesn't mean it actually is.

"

You know if you have actually seen the truth. Just because someone experiences something that seems infinite from their vantage point, doesn't actually mean it is? True. However if someone sees the truth, then they know that the joke is on everyone else. They also realize that no matter what, the opposition will never get it, unless they see this. It is all a very personal experience, that is left to... the individual. This is because the proof lies within the relationship with the Father. However, if you do not believe in the Father, then you obviously do not know him, if you do not know him, why will he share with you the truth?

Anyone can say anything.. about pretty much anything. Anyone can say they know the truth. However, regardless of all the arguments made, and all of the studying of different beliefs.. yadayada... the one whom ultimately knows the truth, knows it, and his mind cannot be changed, as you would not go believing a lie, if you knew the actual story.

Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1722

[Veritas Staff](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: God

« Reply #23 on: July 29, 2007, 04:54:36 PM »

Despite all that can be said about the inherent role of "divine" experience in magical

practice, one has to also consider that there many well be varieties of magical practice which, while they encounter "divine" forces, simply don't acknowledge them as divine. The Buddhist or yogi, upon an experience of the infinite, would not consider this to be the experience of a deity as a christian would understand it, but rather as enlightenment or samadhi. Similarly, in a theoretical vein, there exist schools of thought among "chaos magicians" which refer to a force of "Chaos" which resembles some conceptions elsewhere referred to as "God" (see Liber Null).

So, a successful practitioner of a spiritual magical path will likely encounter the experiences and phenomena which are considered "divine" by christian magicians, regardless of whether they consider them "divine" in the same sense as christian magicians would consider it.

As for miracles; personally, I find the concept of God interfering in our tiny affairs directly to be slightly dubious, and so I suppose I myself am another magician who doesn't really believe in miracles... but at the same time, I do consider it possible that there are simply higher occult principles, as yet beyond the understanding of human magicians (or even, understood as "God"), which account for "miraculous" phenomena.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Pages: 1 [2] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009, Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Official_Pages

63 captures

24 Mar 2006 - 20 Aug 2019

Apr JUN Aug

19

2017 2019 2020

About this capture

Help

Category:Official Pages

CategoryDiscussionView sourceHistory

This page lists all the Official Pages on the Veritas Wiki. These pages are created to inform you of rules or important information.

Subcategories

This category has the following 2 subcategories, out of 2 total.

H

[Help pages](#)

M

[Mentoring](#)

Pages in category "Official Pages"

The following 10 pages are in this category, out of 10 total.

A

[Applying to become a mentor](#)

C

[Veritas:Copyrights](#)

M

[Main Page](#)

[Mentoring:Mentoring program](#)

T

[The Veritas Society](#)

V

[Veritas chatroom](#)

[Veritas Constitution](#)

[Veritas FAQ](#)

[Veritas rules](#)

[Veritas staff](#)

[Category: Categories](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 9 July 2005, at 03:02. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Categories>

82 captures

14 Jun 2006 - 20 Feb 2020

Apr JUN Jul

23

2018 2019 2020

About this capture

Help

Category:Categories

CategoryDiscussionView sourceHistory

This is the top-level list of all categories.

Subcategories

This category has the following 17 subcategories, out of 17 total.

A

Articles

B

Body Energy Arts

Books

C

Categories

D

Definitions

Dreams

L

Logic and Science

M

Magick

O

Official Pages

Organisations

P

People

Philosophy

Psionics

Psychology

R

Religion

S

Spirituality

U

Unknown Category

Category: Categories

Navigation menu

Veritas Society
Main Page
Forums
IRC chat
Recent changes
Random page
Help
Search
Search

Tools
What links here
Related changes
Special pages
Printable version
Permanent link
Page information
Create accountLog in
This page was last modified on 7 May 2006, at 01:51. Privacy policy About Veritas
Disclaimers
Powered by MediaWiki
http://vsociety.net/wiki/Mentoring:Mentoring_program
65 captures
24 Mar 2006 - 27 Jul 2019
May JUL Aug
27
2018 2019 2020

About this capture
Mentoring:Mentoring program
PageDiscussionView sourceHistory
The mentoring program was started to match people who are starting out (mentees) and looking for experienced people (mentors) in a specific path to help and guide them in their studies. The mentee will make an agreement with the mentor as to how they will communicate, and what discussions will be about. It's basically a system meant to match an experienced person with someone looking for a helping hand in their studies.

Contents
1 Mentoring Forums
2 Applying
3 Mentor Bios
4 Applying to become a mentor
Mentoring Forums
To visit the forums specifically related to the program just click here: Mentoring Forums
Applying
All you have to do is post your application here. You will be notified as soon as a mentor

for your subject is available, or we will try to give you an estimate of how long you will have to wait. Upon sending your request to a current mentor you will be notified as soon as time allows.

The following is the proper format for an application to become a mentoring student:

* Name (what you want to be called):

* Age:

* Time Zone:

1. What are you interested in studying at Veritas?

2. What are your other interests?

3. Why are you applying to the mentor program?

4. (Optional) Which mentor you would like. (Please note that this will not guarantee you your preferred mentor, and some mentors are more selective than others.)

To see some of the subject areas which can be studied and some basics of studying, read this forum thread.

The veritas staff can recommend someone if asked but the preferred process is by posting an application here. or by sending a private message to a specific mentor of your own choice.

Mentor Bios

To see who the mentors are and what they mentor specifically please view this page:

Mentor bios

Applying to become a mentor

If you are interested in becoming a mentor please view the following page for details:

Becoming a mentor

Categories: MentoringOfficial Pages

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 2 April 2007, at 23:39. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/The_Veritas_Society

78 captures

5 Feb 2006 - 20 Feb 2020

Apr JUN Jul

18

2018 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[The Veritas Society](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

"The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and science." - Albert Einstein

Welcome to the Veritas Society, a place of discussion and learning. We focus on all metaphysical studies, including psionics, chi and magick. We all come from different social and cultural backgrounds, but are united in our search for truth. If you wish to join us in our search, or study with well established practitioners, read on.

The original Veritas website was founded at the turn of the millennium. The name "Veritas" comes from the Latin word for "truth". Over the years, our community has evolved to include thousands of members, all from very different backgrounds and with very different ideas on metaphysics. We have blossomed and thrived, and can now easily say we are one of the largest and most active energy communities on the Internet. What's our secret?

Because the Veritas Society is a place of learning, we try to promote academic freedom with open discussion and debate of new proposals and theories. We understand that this field of study still has many open questions, and we allow and encourage all kinds of opinions and theories to exist simultaneously within our community. This encourages discussion and research, and stimulates all of our members. Over the years, our member base has grown to include many experienced practitioners, and education has become our second goal next to discussion. Even our staff disagree on certain subjects, so we encourage our members to explore a wide range of theories and determine the truth for themselves.

This website is the portal to our community. The links at the top of this page will take you to the various sections of our website. We have a wiki site with pages written by our

members and staff, an extensive article base of articles written or selected by our teachers, and we have community forums and chatrooms where we discuss various related topics. Keep in mind that although you will be able to view a lot of information on our website, you need to register (for free) in order to edit the wiki, post on the forums, or send private messages to other members.

If you have any more questions about the Veritas Society, take a look at our Frequently Asked Questions page. It has more detailed information on our Society and the people who are part of it. Good luck with your exploration of the metaphysical arts, and most importantly, have fun.

Veritas lux mea. Veritas vos liberabit.

Related Topics

Veritas staff

Veritas rules

Categories: Official PagesOrganisations

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 8 September 2006, at 22:56. Privacy policy About

Veritas Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Veritas_chatroom

24 captures

13 Mar 2006 - 26 Aug 2019

Sep JUN Aug

26

2016 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[Veritas chatroom](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

The Veritas chatroom can be accessed with the java chat link, or it can be connected to with any IRC client.

Server: [irc.sorcery.net](#)

Channels: [#VSociety](#), [#VPractice](#), and [#VMeta](#)

Ports: 6667 (Default port), 7000, 9000

In addition to our main channel [#VSociety](#), we also have a practice room [#VPractice](#), and an on-topic discussion channel [#VMeta](#) on the same IRC server.

For help using the chatroom, read the [chatroom help](#).

Category: [Official Pages](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[34.207.98.73Talk for this IP addressCreate accountLog in](#)

This page was last modified on 21 August 2016, at 22:11. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Veritas_Constitution

[58 captures](#)

[4 Sep 2007](#) - [20 Aug 2019](#)

[Apr](#) [JUN](#) [Aug](#)

[20](#)

[2018](#) [2019](#) [2020](#)

[About this capture](#)

[Veritas Constitution](#)

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

In the interest of maintaining the activity and productivity of the Veritas Society, this document will be the Veritas Constitution. This will be the dominant authority for the Veritas Society. It will go into effect upon approval by any of the methods listed in Article IV. (Approved January 25th, 2007, by 100% of Council, 100% of Staff, and 92.7% of Member votes.)

Contents

1 I. Voting

2 II. Veritas Staff

2.1 A. Veritas Council

2.2 B. Veritas Teachers

2.3 C. Veritas Moderators

2.4 D. Veritas Tech Team

2.5 E. Emergencies

2.6 F. Non-staff positions

3 III. Veritas Rules

4 IV. Amendments

I. Voting

All voting under this document will have one week for voting and discussion, unless otherwise stated. Voting may terminate early if all eligible people have voted. Steps should be taken to ensure that each person votes only once in each category being considered. Votes will be calculated as a percentage of those who vote.

II. Veritas Staff

The Veritas Staff will consist of a Council, Teachers, Moderators, and a Tech Team.

A. Veritas Council

The Council will be the highest administrative authority under this document, and will be responsible for the general guidance and oversight of the community.

1. Council members will be added under any of the following conditions:

a. Unanimous approval by the Council, with one month for voting and discussion.

b. Two-thirds approval by the Council, and two-thirds approval by the Staff, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

c. Two-thirds approval by the Staff, two-thirds approval by the members, and the approval of one Council member, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

d. Three-fourths approval by the Staff, and three-fourths approval by the members, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

2. While it should only be done after careful thought about the future of the community, Council members may be removed under any of the following conditions:

a. Resignation of the Council member.

b. Two-thirds approval by the Council, two-thirds approval by the Staff, and two-thirds approval by the members, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

c. Three-fourths approval by the Staff, two-thirds approval by the members, and the approval of one Council member, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

d. Three-fourths approval by the Staff, and three-fourths approval by the members, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

B. Veritas Teachers

The Veritas Teachers will be responsible for the selection, creation, or direction of educational content. They may delegate these tasks as appropriate.

1. Veritas Teachers will be added under any of the following conditions:

- a. Majority approval by the Council.
- b. Majority approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.

2. Veritas Teachers will be removed under any of the following conditions:

- a. Majority approval by the Council.
- b. Majority approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.

C. Veritas Moderators

The Veritas Moderators will be responsible for monitoring the content of the community, enforcing the rules, and guiding the community in a positive direction.

1. Veritas Moderators will be added under any of the following conditions:

- a. Majority approval by the Council.
- b. Majority approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.
- c. Two-thirds approval by the Staff, and majority approval of the members.

2. Veritas Moderators will be removed under any of the following conditions:

- a. Majority approval by the Council.
- b. Two-thirds approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.
- c. Two-thirds approval by the Staff, and two-thirds approval of the members.

D. Veritas Tech Team

The Tech Team will perform technical tasks for the maintenance of the community, and for the implementation of this document. Various levels of access may be granted to members of the Tech Team by the Council.

1. Tech Team members may be added under any of the following conditions:

- a. Unanimous approval by the Council, with two weeks for voting and discussion.
- b. Majority approval by the Council, and two-thirds approval by the Staff, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

2. Due to the sensitive nature of the access granted to the Tech Team, Tech Team members will be removed under any of the following conditions:

- a. Majority approval by the Council.
- b. Majority approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.

E. Emergencies

During emergency situations, or when a security risk is perceived, access of a Staff member may be temporarily restricted. Upon approval of a Council member, the restriction of access may continue until the completion of a vote.

F. Non-staff positions

Non-staff positions may be created by the Staff as seen fit for the productivity of the community. Unofficial non-staff positions may be created by any Staff member as desired, and official non-staff positions can be created by approval of one member of Council, or by majority vote of the Staff.

III. Veritas Rules

The Veritas Rules will be changed upon any of the following conditions:

- A. Majority approval by the Council.
- B. Majority approval by the Staff, and approval of one Council member.
- C. Two-thirds approval by the Staff, and majority approval by the members.

IV. Amendments

Amendments to this document will be valid under any of the following conditions:

A. Unanimous approval by the Council, and two-thirds approval by the Staff, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

B. Two-thirds approval by the Council, two-thirds approval by the Staff, and two-thirds approval by the members, with two weeks for voting and discussion.

Category: Official Pages

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

34.207.98.73Talk for this IP addressCreate accountLog in

This page was last modified on 31 March 2007, at 16:15. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Veritas_FAQ

33 captures

10 Sep 2006 - 4 Sep 2019

May JUL Sep

04

2018 2019 2020

About this capture

Veritas FAQ

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Frequently Asked Questions about Veritas:

When was Veritas founded? What you see now is the Veritas Society, the most recent installment of the Veritas community. However, it took some time to work up to what is now presented before you. Staff had to age, personal funds had to come into play, member quantity had to expand, teachers had to be trained, and an elongated process of trial and error had to complete itself (a process we are still very much a part of). We started with a brick, not even a cornerstone, and from there have created the full

foundation which we now have. The community was first established in late 1999 by Silverdawn and Darkduck.

What are your main areas of study? The Veritas Society provides teachers and articles within and for the three major branches of the metaphysical arts: Eastern Mysticism (Chi), Psionics, and Magick. Alongside those three main categories also enters room for discussion about dream interpretation, spirituality, astral projection, and various other aspects of the occult not mentioned previously.

What is Veritas's organisational structure? The members make up the largest part of our Society. Some are very active, some only visit once in a while. We also have staff to deal with moderation matters, security and conflicts between members. They serve to maintain the peace in our Society and make sure chat sessions and forum threads don't get out of hand. The Veritas Teachers have no such obligation but are widely recognized as experts in their field of study, and often take on students, write articles or teach classes. The Veritas Council consists of the Society leaders, who decide on policy, promotions and other ruling matters.

I'm interested in learning from some of the experts. How does this work? For each of the three main categories, chi, psionics, and magick, certified teachers which have been hand-picked or trained right here at Veritas are provided for personal instruction on varying levels. These teachers, in conjunction with learned staff members and administrators, browse through their respective parts of the forums on a regular basis, answering questions posed by the regular members when possible. Apart from mainstream forum responses, these teachers also provide articles within their areas of study and expertise for regular public viewing. In addition to what can all be publicly read and seen, several personal students are taken on by the teachers every so often. Who gets to be taught directly, and ultimately trained to teacher status (or at least teaching level), is decided by a process of application, in which the aspiring members fill out an application to the head-instructor of their desired area of learning. These applications are then viewed and thoroughly examined until the teachers decide who shall be taken on. Once accepted, the aspiring students progress through a sequence of courses designed and presented by the corresponding Veritas Teacher.

How do I start learning? See [How to start](#).

Category: [Official Pages](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 4 November 2009, at 02:21. [Privacy policy](#) [About](#)

[Veritas Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Veritas_rules

64 captures

13 Mar 2006 - 20 Aug 2019

Apr JUN Aug

20

2018 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[Veritas rules](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

[Veritas rules for the forums, the wiki, and IRC](#)

[Show respect to others.](#)

[Do not flood, spam, or post garbage text on the channel, forums, or wiki.](#)

[Do not submit comments which are obscene, hateful, or threatening.](#)

[Do not mimic a staff member's ID.](#)

[Do not change your identity or IP to evade a ban.](#)

[People may not engage in behaviors that are both persistently disruptive and blatantly delusional.](#)

[Respect the authority of Staff and Faculty.](#)

[Use constructive criticism, rather than being abusive.](#)

[Be respectful of other systems, styles, and approaches.](#)

[On-topic groups and organizations may announce events or recruit only if they do not require a financial commitment at any level. Discussion and testimonials about groups and organizations is allowed.](#)

[Dispute resolution](#)

[If edit wars emerge on the Veritas wiki, the following is the dispute resolution process which will be policy here for resolving any edit wars or editorial conflicts. Please edit respectfully and judiciously so that this dispute resolution process is rarely needed.](#)

[Consider the dispute topic carefully by the weight of the evidence.](#)

[If one view has significantly more evidence, describe it as such.](#)

[If both sides have comparable evidence, split the topic and describe both sides.](#)

[If one view has significantly more evidence, but the other view is still of historical or](#)

popular importance, then split the topic and describe the less supported view as less supported or unsupported but still of historical importance or in popular use.

Staff can intervene to enforce the above rules by announcing which approach of the above should be taken, and by carefully explaining their reasoning.

If the staff decisions are not adhered to, editing privileges can be revoked for a time.

Moderators should defer to the decisions of Teachers for dispute resolution, particularly in their area of expertise.

See also

The Veritas Constitution.

Category: Official Pages

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

34.207.98.73Talk for this IP addressCreate accountLog in

This page was last modified on 29 October 2015, at 18:10. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Veritas_staff

52 captures

3 Mar 2006 - 31 Jan 2020

May JUL Aug

03

2018 2019 2020

About this capture

Veritas staff

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

This page lists the current Veritas Staff members and their position.

Contents

1 List of Veritas Staff

1.1 Council
1.2 Teachers
1.3 Moderators
2 Retired
2.1 Teachers Emeriti
List of Veritas Staff
Council
Mobius
kobok
TakeV
Teachers
kobok
Mobius
Rawiri
Svatejasaa
XIII
Moderators
Faijer
Impervious
kobok
Mobius
Rafnul
Shadow_Dragon
Silver_Archer
TakeV
Trowa
Vitamyst
XIII

Retired
Teachers Emeriti
ChezNips
Kettle
Koujiryuu
Prophecy
Veos
Category: Official Pages
Navigation menu
Veritas Society
Main Page
Forums
IRC chat
Recent changes
Random page
Help

Search
Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 3 June 2017, at 21:01. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Categories>

82 captures

14 Jun 2006 - 20 Feb 2020

Apr JUN Jul

23

2018 2019 2020

About this capture

Help

Category:Categories

CategoryDiscussionView sourceHistory

This is the top-level list of all categories.

Subcategories

This category has the following 17 subcategories, out of 17 total.

A

Articles

B

Body Energy Arts

Books

C

Categories

D

Definitions

Dreams

L

Logic and Science

M

Magick

O

Official Pages

[Organisations](#)

[P](#)

[People](#)

[Philosophy](#)

[Psionics](#)

[Psychology](#)

[R](#)

[Religion](#)

[S](#)

[Spirituality](#)

[U](#)

[Unknown Category](#)

[Category: Categories](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 7 May 2006, at 01:51. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Body_Energy_Arts_articles

81 captures

3 Mar 2006 - 20 Aug 2019

Oct SEP Dec

16

2017 2018 2019

[About this capture](#)

[Body Energy Arts articles](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

The Body Energy Arts (BEA) overlap an individual's etheric power and spiritual self with

the body, including Qi Gong (also called "Chi Kung"), Ki, Yoga, Reiki, etc.

Qigong

Simplified Qigong for Beginners - A simplified version of the author's other article, "Beginning Daoist Qigong". For those who want to start practicing qigong without worrying about terminology.

Beginning Daoist Qigong - Koujiryuu's beginning guide to Daoist Qigong, the practice of circulating and strengthening qi in the energetic body.

Intermediate Daoyin Qigong and Applications - Koujiryuu's follow-up to his beginning guide on Daoist qigong, which deals with the furthering of this practice.

"The Secret of the Golden Flower" with Commentary - An interpretation of the Daoist alchemical treatise, complete with translations and explanations.

Iron Shirt and Golden Bell Qi Gong from a Psionics Perspective - Kettle's article on one approach to Iron Shirt Qigong.

Iron Hand and Iron Body - The Metaphysical Boxing Approach - donjitsu2's article on an Iron Hand and Body training routine.

Ch'i Overview - ChezNips' Confucianist (TCM) approach to Ch'i.

Introduction to Meridians ChezNips' Traditional Chinese Medicine approach to meridians.

Miscellaneous Topics

Mantra Meditation - KiwiKid's rendition of mantric meditation, complete with mantras and practice.

Auric Emanations - A treatise on auric fields, complete with methods on seeing and interpreting them.

The Nature of True Intent - An explanatory article about forming correct intent, and the power of delusion.

Chi and Martial Arts dictionary - A complete guide to terms used in Chi and Martial arts.

Reflexology - Reflexology is a technique of diagnosing and treating problems in the body by massaging certain parts of the body.

Swordplay and Energy - A transcription of an IRC class session on swordplay and energy manipulation by Defender and Darkduck.

Qing Gong - Fireblade's training methods for Qing Gong, or "light skill", a martial training method to make one light on their feet.

Yoga - ChezNips' introductory article on Yoga.

Daoist Philosophy Primer - Serves as an introduction to philosophical Daoism (Taoism).

Care of the Physical Body - Discusses taking care of the physical body when pursuing an ascetic lifestyle.

Huna: A Background and Overview - Discusses the art of Huna.

For a complete list of Veritas Articles on the body energy arts, [click here](#).

Categories: [Articles](#)[Body Energy Arts](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[34.207.98.73Talk for this IP address](#)[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 7 August 2012, at 17:22. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Spirituality>

58 captures

14 Jun 2006 - 20 Aug 2019

Apr JUN Aug

20

2017 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[Help](#)

[Category: Spirituality](#)

[Category Discussion](#) [View source](#) [History](#)

Spirituality deals with matters of the spirit or soul and its relationship with other people or events in life.

Spirituality articles - An index of Veritas Articles on spirituality.

[Subcategories](#)

This category has only the following subcategory.

[R](#)

[Religion](#)

[Pages in category "Spirituality"](#)

The following 10 pages are in this category, out of 10 total.

[B](#)

[Bible](#)

[E](#)

[Enlightenment](#)

[H](#)

[Huna](#)

[M](#)

[Mysticism](#)

[N](#)

[Near-death experience](#)

[S](#)

[Soul](#)

[Spiritual guide](#)

[Spirituality](#)

[Spirituality articles](#)

[Spirituality eBooks](#)

[Category: Categories](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[34.207.98.73Talk for this IP address](#)[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 10 July 2005, at 17:11. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

[Powered by MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Religion>

[22 captures](#)

[14 Jun 2007](#) - [4 Sep 2019](#)

[May](#) [JUL](#) [Sep](#)

[04](#)

[2016](#) [2019](#) [2020](#)

[About this capture](#)

[Help](#)

[Category:Religion](#)

[CategoryDiscussion](#)[View source](#)[History](#)

This list contains all pages about Religion

Pages in category "Religion"

The following 11 pages are in this category, out of 11 total.

[A](#)

[Avatars](#)

[B](#)

[Bible](#)

[C](#)

[Christianity](#)

[Christianity and Metaphysics](#)

[D](#)

[Divine](#)

[E](#)

[Enlightenment](#)

[I](#)

[Incarnation](#)

[J](#)

[Jehovah](#)

[M](#)

[Mysticism](#)

[V](#)

[Voodoo](#)

[W](#)

[Wicca](#)

[Categories: CategoriesSpirituality](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 5 August 2005, at 02:20. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Avatars>

18 captures

17 May 2008 - 6 Sep 2019

May JUL Sep

04

2016 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[Avatars](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

The term avatar refers to a manifestation or incarnation of an entity or deity. In Hinduism incarnations of Vishnu are referred to as avatars.

Other Uses

A forum avatar is a small picture near a member's name on an internet forum. The picture is used to uniquely identify that person more quickly than checking the name, and also as a stylistic statement.

Category: Religion

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 7 September 2005, at 01:08. Privacy policy About

Veritas Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Bible>

21 captures

14 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Bible

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

The english word bible comes from the greek word βιβλία, biblia, to the greeks meant "book" and refers to any book.

Contents

1 Christian Bible

1.1 Canon

1.2 Message of the bible

1.3 As a spiritual text

Christian Bible

Christianity uses the term bible, or "holy bible", to refer to certain compilations of writings which the various denominations of the christian religion consider as the basis for it's existence and beliefs. This bible is traditionally categorized into two sections, the old testament and the new testament, for the purpose of distinguishing the Jewish writings, which the christians see as the basis for the christian texts, from the christian writings.

Canon

The term "canon" is used to describe the groupings of books which are considered to be official christian texts of proper authenticity. Different denominations have different sets of books which they consider canon, but most of the books of any one set appear in all of the sets.

The following Jewish books do not appear in all canon sets: 1 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, Odes, Wisdom, Sirach, Psalms of Solomon, Baruch, and Letter of Jeremiah. Each of these books appear in the old testament section, for the canons which adopt them.

Just as there are books of the "old testament" which are not considered canon by all christian groups, there are also "new testament" writings which are considered to be of dubious authenticity, a complete listing of which can be found at Comparative Religion along with electronic reproductions of the texts.

Message of the bible

Despite the numerous attacks against the christian religion and a large dislike among non-christians for certain aspects of christianity as it is presented by the christians, the majority of these attacks seem to be against the christian people or the acts performed by the christians rather than the bible itself, though there are still a fair number of criticisms against the message(s) portrayed by the bible.

Even without these external criticisms, there seems to be a confusion among christian followers regarding the message(s) portrayed by the bible bringing into sharp debate issues such as the necessity of baptism, faith with and without works, the divinity of Jesus, and the possibilities of miracles in today's world as well as such inane things as whether instruments should be used in worship, and whether christians can be homosexual or even practitioners of magick.

Because various portions of the bible discuss many varied topics it is sometimes difficult for christians to remember the base message of the entire bible, which is love and

obedience. Throughout both the old testament and the new testament the topic of obedience is clearly illustrated through the stories portrayed and through the supposed words of Jehovah (literally in the english alphabet JHVH or YHWH, and יהוה in the hebrew alphabet). To many readers the topic of love in the old testament is overshadowed by Jehovah's destructive and commanding natures but is one of the most expounded upon topics in the new testament, drawing the arguement from outside sources that the "jewish god of the old testament" is completely different from the "christian god of the new testament" and should be viewed as two seperate entities altogether.

As a spiritual text

Regardless of whether you believe in the historical validity of the new testament of the bible there are many today, even among non-christians, who see the new testament as a great spiritual guide due to it's continual portrayal of the need for humans to take on qualities such as love and morality.

However, the old testament is continually overlooked as a spiritual guide, once again probably due to the overshadowing by Jehovah's "less spiritual" natures, with the exception of the book of Ecclesiastes which is viewed by some as a book of wisdom.

Categories: [Spirituality](#)[Religion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 24 August 2005, at 23:42. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)
[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Christianity>

7 captures
10 Oct 2008 - 22 Jul 2014
Sep JUL Aug
22
2013 2014 2015

About this capture
The Veritas Society
HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp
Go to Page Go to Page
Log in / create account
Page Discussion View source History
Christianity

One of the major Abrahamic religions which follows the tenets of the man Jesus, called the Christ, as outlined in the various New Testament books of the Bible and/or apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. There are many denominations of Christianity, each with its own biases and doctrines focusing on certain aspects of Jesus' teachings, as well as a non-denominational sect which claims to attempt to adhere as closely as possible to the original teachings of Jesus and Jesus' apostles.

There are also a number of organizations which claim to be Christian but seemingly develop their own teachings and follow those instead of what Jesus truly taught; Catholics (via the Popes, and groups which decide which doctrines to believe in), Jehovah's Witnesses (claim that Jesus came again with new teachings for mankind to follow), Mormons (use both the Bible and the Book of Mormon which was supposedly discovered through divine guidance by Mormon founder Joseph Smith Jr buried in a hill near his home), and others.

Category:
Religion
Toolbox
What links here Related changes Special pages
Veritas License 1.0
This page has been accessed 1,742 times.
This page was last modified on 4 October 2007, at 18:44.
MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Christianity_and_Metaphysics
14 captures
12 May 2008 - 28 Aug 2016
Jul AUG Sep
28
2014 2016 2017

About this capture
Christianity and Metaphysics

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)
[Debates](#)
circa August 2006

circa June 2007

[Christian Thinking](#)
[Christian Behavior](#)

[Explaining Christianity's Relationship to Metaphysics](#)
[God/Jesus and Magic](#)

[Categories: Significant Forum TopicsReligion](#)
[Navigation menu](#)
[Veritas Society](#)
[Main Page](#)
[Forums](#)
[IRC chat](#)
[Recent changes](#)
[Random page](#)
[Help](#)
[Search](#)
[Search](#)

[Tools](#)
[What links here](#)
[Related changes](#)
[Special pages](#)
[Printable version](#)
[Permanent link](#)
[Page information](#)
[Create accountLog in](#)
This page was last modified on 25 July 2007, at 15:43. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)
[Disclaimers](#)
[Powered by MediaWiki](#)
<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Divine>
25 captures
10 Sep 2006 - 19 Dec 2016
Aug DEC Jan
19
2015 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)
[Divine](#)
[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)
Within the metaphysical perspective, divine is that which is in relation to, or originating

from a "higher power," or that which is "godly". The second application, is the act of using divination, for a particular purpose.

It is also used to refer to the ultimate form of God, in that the Divine created the Universe, and all other gods (including the Judeochristian God, the Egyption Gods etc) were created later (usually referred to as thought forms).

Categories: [Magick](#)[Religion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[52.86.176.3](#)[Talk for this IP address](#)[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 2 October 2007, at 16:51. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Enlightenment>

[21 captures](#)

2 Jan 2007 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Enlightenment](#)

[Page](#)[Discussion](#)[View source](#)[History](#)

Enlightenment is a state of understanding or wisdom. Within Buddhism and Hinduism, enlightenment is considered to be the absence of desire and suffering. From a spiritualist perspective, enlightenment is usually considered to be a state of spiritual awareness and growth.

See also the [Age of Enlightenment](#).

Categories: SpiritualityReligion

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 11 October 2007, at 23:40. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Incarnation>

9 captures

12 May 2008 - 5 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

05

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp

Go to Page Go to Page

Log in / create account

Page Discussion View source History

Incarnation

An incarnation is a distinct physical form or state; or the embodiment of a soul or deity.

Categories:

Definitions

Religion

Toolbox

What links here Related changes Special pages

Veritas License 1.0

This page has been accessed 3,002 times.
This page was last modified on 4 October 2007, at 18:17.
MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Definitions>

30 captures

2 Jan 2007 - 27 Jul 2019

Mar JUN Aug

26

2013 2014 2016

About this capture

The Veritas Society

[Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Recent Changes](#)[Random](#) [Page](#)[Help](#)

[Go to Page](#) [Go to Page](#)

[Log in / create account](#)

[Category Discussion](#) [View source](#) [History](#)

Category:Definitions

This page lists all the defintions that are currently housed on our Wiki.

Pages in category "Definitions"

The following 38 pages are in this category, out of 38 total.

A

Angels

Astral projection

B

Brain

C

Chakras

Clairaudience

Clairsentience

Clairvoyance

Conscious

D

Demon

Divination

Dowsing

E

Empathy

Entity

E cont.

Esoteric

G

Ghost

I

[Incarnation](#)

[K](#)

[Kinet](#)

[M](#)

[Martial arts](#)

[Metaconscious](#)

[Metaphysical arts](#)

[Metaphysical energy](#)

[Metaphysical paradigm](#)

[Metaphysics](#)

[Mind](#)

[N](#)

[Nonconscious](#)

[O](#)

[Occam's razor](#)

[O cont.](#)

[Omen](#)

[P](#)

[Paranormal](#)

[Probability](#)

[Psion](#)

[R](#)

[Random number generator](#)

[Retrocognition](#)

[S](#)

[Sleep paralysis](#)

[Soul](#)

[Soul separation](#)

[Spiritualism](#)

[Subconscious](#)

[U](#)

[Unconscious](#)

[Category:](#)

[Categories](#)

[Toolbox](#)

[What links here](#) [Related changes](#) [Special pages](#)

[Veritas License 1.0](#)

This page has been accessed 3,230 times.

This page was last modified on 9 July 2005, at 10:29.

[MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Religion>

22 captures

14 Jun 2007 - 4 Sep 2019

Mar JUL Aug

01

[2013](#) [2014](#) [2016](#)

[About this capture](#)
[The Veritas Society](#)
[Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Recent Changes](#)[Random Page](#)[Help](#)
[Go to Page](#) [Go to Page](#)
[Log in / create account](#)
[Category Discussion](#) [View source](#) [History](#)
[Category:Religion](#)
This list contains all pages about Religion

Pages in category "Religion"
The following 11 pages are in this category, out of 11 total.

[A](#)
[Avatars](#)
[B](#)
[Bible](#)
[C](#)
[Christianity](#)
[Christianity and Metaphysics](#)
[D](#)
[Divine](#)
[E](#)
[Enlightenment](#)
[I](#)
[Incarnation](#)
[J](#)
[Jehovah](#)
[M](#)
[Mysticism](#)
[V](#)
[Voodoo](#)
[W](#)
[Wicca](#)
[Categories:](#)
[Categories](#)
[Spirituality](#)
[Toolbox](#)

[What links here](#) [Related changes](#) [Special pages](#)
[Veritas License 1.0](#)
This page has been accessed 2,987 times.
This page was last modified on 5 August 2005, at 02:20.
[MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Jehovah>

8 captures

16 May 2008 - 22 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

22

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp

Go to Page Go to Page

Log in / create account

Page Discussion View source History

Jehovah

Jehovah is one english translation of the hebrew name for the creator god. In hebrew the name is יהוה. Another english translation is Yahweh. The names of these hebrew letters are י yod ה heh ו vav ה heh; yod being pronounced similar to a j sound, heh being pronounced similar to an h sound, and vav being pronounced similar to either a v or w sound depending on who you talk to.

In various english bibles the hebrew name of the creator god is typically translated to "Jehovah", or "The LORD" (in small capitals). Due to both the hebrew old testament and greek new testament using the term "lord" to refer to various people, some people have a misunderstanding that anywhere the word "lord" (all lowercase letters) appears in the english text that it refers to Jehovah, particularly in the new testament when the word lord is used in reference to Jesus whom some believe was Jehovah incarnated.

Jeremiah 16:21 Therefore, behold, I will cause them to know, this once will I cause them to know My hand and My might; and they shall know that My name is the LORD.

<http://www.mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/pt1116.htm>

I AM

Another term which Jehovah uses for himself is אהיה אשר אהיה which is translated to "I AM that I AM"

Exodus 3:13,14 13 And Moses said unto God: 'Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them: The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me: What is His name? what shall I say unto them?' 14 And God said unto Moses: 'I AM THAT I AM'; and He said: 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel: I AM hath sent me unto you.' <http://www.mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/pt0203.htm>

Twice Jesus says of himself "εγω ειμι", or in english "εγω: I, me, my" and "ειμι: to be, to exist, to happen, to be present" (aka, I am); once when he told the pharasees that he (Jesus) is greater than their father Abraham, and once when he replies to the roman soldiers who came to arrest him in the garden of gethsemane. Because of this some believe that Jesus was calling himself Jehovah.

John 8:58 - Jesus said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am."
John 18:5 - They answered him, "Jesus of Nazareth." Jesus said to them, "I am."

However, the greek term "ἐγώ ειμι" is used to denote as we would say in english "I am he" or "I am that one", as Peter shows in Acts 10:21 when some men show up at his doorstep looking for him and he tells them he is the one they are looking for.

21 And Peter went down to the men and said, "I am the one you are looking for; what is the reason for your coming?"

External Links

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php?topic=6119.msg75043#msg75043>

Online Greek Bible

Category:

Religion

Toolbox

What links here Related changes Special pages

Veritas License 1.0

This page has been accessed 3,131 times.

This page was last modified on 24 August 2005, at 23:50.

MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Mysticism>

22 captures

15 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Mysticism

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Mysticism is the experience of a divine union with a "higher power", or the knowledge gained by such a union. Mysticism can also refer to the belief in a non-physical reality, or a part of reality beyond ordinary perception, and often considers this non-ordinary aspect of reality to be central to existence.

Categories: SpiritualityReligion

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 15 September 2005, at 23:08. [Privacy policy](#) [About](#)

[Veritas Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Voodoo>

20 captures

14 Jun 2007 - 19 Dec 2016

[Aug](#) [DEC](#) [Jan](#)

19

[2015](#) [2016](#) [2017](#)

[About this capture](#)

[Voodoo](#)

[Page](#)[Discussion](#)[View source](#)[History](#)

Voodoo (also Vodun, Vodou, or Vudu) is a religion of West African origin with many integrated magick practices. This art is similar to witchcraft in that it harnesses "energy currents" that run through the Earth; upon assistance of the Loas (gods) such energies may grant favours and abilities, when they are invoked.

[Categories: MagickReligion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[52.86.176.3Talk for this IP address](#)[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 5 August 2005, at 01:13. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Wicca>

26 captures

2 Jan 2007 - 19 Dec 2016

Sep DEC Jan

19

2015 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Wicca](#)

[Page](#)[Discussion](#)[View source](#)[History](#)

Wicca is a neo-Pagan religion, founded by Gerald Gerdner, approximatly in 1951.

Wicca is polytheistic and is based on the worship of the cycles of Nature and the living things there-in.

There are different sects of Wicca, including Eclectic and Faery Wicca.

Often associated with witchcraft, Wiccans may practice certain magicks in their religious rites, but practicing Wicca is no more synonymous with being a witch, as practicing Christianity.

[Reference](#)

[Living Wicca: A Guide For The Solitary Practitioner](#), by Scott Cunningham (1993, Llewlllyn Publications, St. Paul MN)

[External Links](#)

[Categories: Magick](#)[Religion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

52.86.176.3Talk for this IP addressCreate accountLog in

This page was last modified on 9 February 2011, at 18:01. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Bible>

21 captures

14 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Bible](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

The english word bible comes from the greek word βιβλία, biblia, to the greeks meant "book" and refers to any book.

Contents

1 Christian Bible

1.1 Canon

1.2 Message of the bible

1.3 As a spiritual text

Christian Bible

Christianity uses the term bible, or "holy bible", to refer to certain compilations of writings which the various denominations of the christian religion consider as the basis for it's existance and beliefs. This bible is traditionally categorized into two sections, the old testament and the new testament, for the purpose of distinguishing the Jewish writings, which the christians see as the basis for the christian texts, from the christian writings.

Canon

The term "canon" is used to describe the groupings of books which are considered to be official christian texts of proper authenticity. Different denominations have different sets of books which they consider canon, but most of the books of any one set appear in all of the sets.

The following Jewish books do not appear in all canon sets: 1 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, 1

Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, Odes, Wisdom, Sirach, Psalms of Solomon, Baruch, and Letter of Jeremiah. Each of these books appear in the old testament section, for the canons which adopt them.

Just as there are books of the “old testament” which are not considered canon by all christian groups, there are also “new testament” writings which are considered to be of dubious authenticity, a complete listing of which can be found at Comparative Religion along with electronic reproductions of the texts.

Message of the bible

Despite the numerous attacks against the christian religion and a large dislike among non-christians for certain aspects of christianity as it is presented by the christians, the majority of these attacks seem to be against the christian people or the acts performed by the christians rather than the bible itself, though there are still a fair number of criticisms against the message(s) portrayed by the bible.

Even without these external criticisms, there seems to be a confusion among christian followers regarding the message(s) portrayed by the bible bringing into sharp debate issues such as the necessity of baptism, faith with and without works, the divinity of Jesus, and the possibilities of miracles in today's world as well as such inane things as whether instruments should be used in worship, and whether christians can be homosexual or even practitioners of magick.

Because various portions of the bible discuss many varied topics it is sometimes difficult for christians to remember the base message of the entire bible, which is love and obedience. Throughout both the old testament and the new testament the topic of obedience is clearly illustrated through the stories portrayed and through the supposed words of Jehovah (literally in the english alphabet JHVH or YHWH, and יהוה in the hebrew alphabet). To many readers the topic of love in the old testament is overshadowed by Jehovah's destructive and commanding natures but is one of the most expounded upon topics in the new testament, drawing the argument from outside sources that the “jewish god of the old testament” is completely different from the “christian god of the new testament” and should be viewed as two separate entities altogether.

As a spiritual text

Regardless of whether you believe in the historical validity of the new testament of the bible there are many today, even among non-christians, who see the new testament as a great spiritual guide due to it's continual portrayal of the need for humans to take on qualities such as love and morality.

However, the old testament is continually overlooked as a spiritual guide, once again

probably due to the overshadowing by Jehovah's "less spiritual" natures, with the exception of the book of Ecclesiastes which is viewed by some as a book of wisdom.

Categories: SpiritualityReligion

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 24 August 2005, at 23:42. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Enlightenment>

21 captures

2 Jan 2007 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Enlightenment

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Enlightenment is a state of understanding or wisdom. Within Buddhism and Hinduism, enlightenment is considered to be the absence of desire and suffering. From a spiritualist perspective, enlightenment is usually considered to be a state of spiritual awareness and growth.

See also the Age of Enlightenment.

Categories: SpiritualityReligion

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

[Main Page](#)
[Forums](#)
[IRC chat](#)
[Recent changes](#)
[Random page](#)
[Help](#)
[Search](#)
[Search](#)

[Tools](#)
[What links here](#)
[Related changes](#)
[Special pages](#)
[Printable version](#)
[Permanent link](#)
[Page information](#)
[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 11 October 2007, at 23:40. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)
[Powered by MediaWiki](#)
<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Huna>
[23 captures](#)
14 Jun 2007 - 28 Aug 2016
Jul AUG Sep
28
2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Huna](#)
[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

Huna is the name given by Max Freedom Long to a system of Hawaiian spirituality.

[Introduction to Huna - A Veritas Article introducing the history of Huna.](#)

[Huna - A Veritas Article describing the principles of Huna.](#)

[Category: Spirituality](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

Tools

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 21 July 2005, at 14:44. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Mysticism>

22 captures

15 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Mysticism](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

Mysticism is the experience of a divine union with a "higher power", or the knowledge gained by such a union. Mysticism can also refer to the belief in a non-physical reality, or a part of reality beyond ordinary perception, and often considers this non-ordinary aspect of reality to be central to existence.

Categories: [Spirituality](#)[Religion](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

Tools

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 15 September 2005, at 23:08. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#) [Disclaimers](#)

Powered by MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Near-death_experience

22 captures

1 Jan 2007 - 9 Sep 2016

Jul SEP Oct

09

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Near-death experience](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

A near-death experience (NDE,) is an event in which a person comes close to dying, or is temporarily clinically dead, and during this time experiences a departure from the physical body, and travels about as a soul.

Some of those who have a NDE report having been in a long dark tunnel with a light at the end, seeing themselves hovering above their body, being visited by dead loved ones, and/or seeing "angels". An NDE is similar to an out of body experience, but is differentiated by the presence of physical death, and often by the above mentioned characteristic experiences of an NDE.

See also: [etheric projection](#), [astral projection](#)

[Category: Spirituality](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 21 July 2005, at 14:45. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Soul>

24 captures

11 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Soul](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

The soul is a nonphysical component of the self, which forms the central aspect of our being, separates from the body during out of body experiences, and which continues existing after the death of the physical body.

This aspect of ourselves, also called the superconscious, was believed to be what makes humans share experiences, which manifest in forms of archetypes. Carl Jung believed that all souls are connected and that a vast collective unconscious was tapped into, when we dreamed. A similar concept to the collective unconscious, but with experimental rigor Jung believed was impossible, has been revealed in field consciousness studies.

Categories: [Definitions](#)[Spirituality](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 3 August 2005, at 10:35. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by MediaWiki

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spiritual_guide

24 captures

14 Jun 2007 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Spiritual guide

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

A spiritual guide is a being which is closely associated with an individual's soul, and provides a continual guiding influence to direct the person toward greater learning and spiritual growth. Spiritual guides are known in many different systems by many different terms, such as "guardian angels", "guardian spirits", "counselors", and sometimes the "Holy spirit".

Category: Spirituality

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 25 July 2005, at 23:05. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spirituality>

29 captures

1 Jan 2007 - 28 Aug 2016

Sep AUG Sep

28

2014 2016 2017

[About this capture](#)

[Spirituality](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

Spirituality deals with matters of the spirit or soul and its relationship with other people or events in life.

[Spirituality articles](#) - An index of Veritas Articles on spirituality.

[All wiki pages on spirituality](#)

[Category: Spirituality](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create accountLog in](#)

This page was last modified on 10 July 2005, at 17:11. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

[Powered by MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spirituality_articles

[23 captures](#)

[14 Sep 2006](#) - [28 Aug 2016](#)

[Oct](#) [AUG](#) [Sep](#)

[28](#)

[2014](#) [2016](#) [2017](#)

[About this capture](#)

[Spirituality articles](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

Spirituality is an important aspect of many of the metaphysical arts. This page indexes some of the Veritas Articles on spirituality and philosophy.

[Self Mastery](#) - Prophecy's guide to obtaining self mastery as a prerequisite to mastering the external world.

[Zen Buddhism](#) - Star's introduction to Zen Buddhism.

[Understanding Basic Human Needs](#) - Lady Kalee's article on the effects of fulfillment or lack thereof.

[Laws of the Mind](#) - Star's description of several laws that govern thinking.

[Categories: SpiritualityArticles](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 3 March 2009, at 08:06. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spirituality_eBooks

81 captures

1 Sep 2006 - 22 Feb 2020

Aug SEP Oct

30

2017 2018 2019

[About this capture](#)

[Spirituality eBooks](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

"This is an online index of eBooks that any Energy Artist may wish to obtain. All the eBooks are free and in the public Domain.

The idea for this came to me when seeing the Bob Hendricks Memorial CM Library on [www.OccultFourms.com] and after seeing the Sacred Magick website fall victim to bandwidth strangulation. I figured veritas could use a Library for each of its varied subjects. A post will be made in Psionics, Body Energy Arts, Magick and Spirituality after I find enough files to make a decent post. I would Like to Thank Bob Hendricks for his phenomenal Library and the inspiration to spread the information via this Index, God

rest his Soul." Taken from The Magick eBook Index Thread by Adept

Kudos to Adept for the initial list of e-books. You may need Adobe Acrobat Reader to read these, which can be found here.

If you have read an e-book listed here, please provide a summary to the right of the link for that e-book. Thank you. :)

Contents

1 Buddhism

1.1 General Buddhism

1.2 Buddhist Meditation

1.3 Buddhist Scripture

2 Christianity

2.1 Apocrypha

3 Hebrew

4 Wicca & Witchcraft

5 Hinduism

6 Taoism (Daoism)

7 Islam

7.1 Quran & its Interpretations

7.2 Various

Buddhism

Many Thanks to Buddhanet.net for provideing this huge assortment of books on Buddhism. <http://www.buddhanet.net/ebooks.htm>

General Buddhism

Modern Buddhism - The Path of Compassion and Wisdom -- Geshe Kelsang Gyatso

Good Question, Good Answer -- Ven. S. Dhammika

The Four Noble Truths -- Ven. Ajahn Sumedho

Now is the Knowing -- Ven. Ajahn Sumedho

Intuitive Awareness -- Ven. Ajahn Sumedho

The Eightfold Path for the Householder -- Jack Kornfeld

Fundamentals of Buddhism -- Dr Peter D. Santina

The Tree of Enlightenment -- Dr Peter D. Santina

The Buddha, His Life and Teachings -- Ven. Piyadassi

Buddhism in a Nutshell -- Ven. Narada. Thera

Essential Themes of Buddhist Lectures

Reading the Mind -- K. Khao-Suan-Luang

Scientific Acceptability of Rebirth -- Dr. Granville Dharmawardena

A Tree in the Forest -- A Collection of Ajahn Chah's Similies

Wind in the Forest -- Poems by Ven. Sujiva 3mb file

Dharma Mind, Worldly Mind -- David Smith

Buddhism as a Religion -- Ven. Dr. K. Sri Dhammananda

What Buddhists Believe (Expanded 4th edition) -- Ven. Dr. K. Sri Dhammananda

The Buddhist Way -- Ven. Dr. K. Sri Dhammananda

Buddhism for the Future -- Ven. Dr. K. Sri Dhammananda
 Facing the Future -- Bhikkhu Bodhi
 Snow in the Summer -- Ven. Sayadaw U Jotika
 Animal Magnetism -- Francis Story
 From Womb to Womb -- Francis Story
 Handbook For Mankind -- Buddhadasa, Bhikkhu
 The Natural Cure for Spiritual Disease -- Buddhadasa, Bhikkhu
 Buddha Dhamma for University Students -- Buddhadasa, Bhikkhu
 Only We Can Help Ourselves -- Ven. Dhammavuddho
 The Art of Living -- Ven. Master Chin Kung
 To Understand Buddhism -- Ven. Master Chin Kung
 Buddhism as an Education -- Ven. Master Chin Kung
 The Light of Asia -- Sir Edwin Arnold
 Buddha's Constant Companion - Ven. Ananda -- by Ven. Weragoda Sarada
 Women in Buddhism - Question & Answers -- Ven. Chatsumarn Kabilsingh Ph.D
 Preparing for Death & Helping the Dying -- Sangye Khadro
 A Guide to a Proper Buddhist Funeral -- Koperasi Buddhisme Malaysia Berhad
 The Many Faces of Death -- Jacqui James
 To Cherish All Life -- Roshi Philip Kapleau *4mb file*
 Buddhist Pilgrimage -- Chan Khoon San *3mb file*
 Beyond Belief: A Buddhist Critique of Fundamental Christianity -- A L De Silva
 Phra Buddha Dhammacakra -- Wat Phra Rama *3mb file*
 Liao-Fan's Four Lessons -- Liao-Fan Yuan
 The Seeker's Glossary of Buddhism -- Sutra Translation Committee of USA/Canada
 4.7mb file
 Buddhist Meditation
 Fundamentals of Ch'an Meditation Practice — by Ting Chen, Tr. Master Lok To
 The Gates of Chan Buddhism — by Venerable Jing Hui
 The Sweet Dews of Ch'an — by Reverend Cheng Kuan
 Taming the Monkey Mind — Cheng Wei-an. Tr. by Dharma Master Suddhisukha
 Practical Vipassana Exercises — Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw
 Seven Stages of Purification & Insight Knowledges — Ven. Matara Sri Nanarama
 Keeping the Breath in Mind & Lessons in Samadhi — Ajaan Lee Dhammadharo
 Frames of Reference — Ajaan Lee Dhammadharo
 Dhamma Discourses on Vipassana Meditation — Ven. Sayadaw U Kundala
 Living Meditation, Living Insight — Dr. Thynn Thynn
 A Guide to Awareness — H.H. Somdet Phra Nānasamvara
 On The Path To Freedom — Sayadaw U Pandita
 Mindfulness: The Path of the Deathless — Ven. Ajahn Sumedho
 Invitation to Insight Meditation — Ven. Visuddhacara
 The Vipassana Retreat — Ven. Pannyavaro
 Insight Meditation Workshop Online — Ven. Pannyavaro
 The Art of Attention — Ven. Pannyavaro
 For the Stilling of Volcanoes — Ven. Sujiva
 Incomplete List**
 Buddhist Scripture

Dhammapada
The Diamond Sutra
Christianity
Searchable Bible
Apocrypha
The Gospel According to Mary Magdelene (The Gospel of Mary)
The Gospel of Thomas
Hebrew
The Book of Enoch
Wicca & Witchcraft
Ariadia, or a Gospel of the Witches
The Witchcult in Western Europe
The God of the Witches
Witchcraft Today
The Garnerian Book of Shadows
Alexandrian Book of Shadows
8 Sabbats of Witchcraft
Mastering Witchcraft
The Basics of Magick
The Malleus Maleficarum (HTML- eBook style)
Hinduism
Bhagavad Gita
Brahma Sutras
Lord Shiva and His Worship
Lord Krishna, His Lilas and Teachings

Taoism (Daoism)
Tao te Ching
Foundations of Taoist Practice
Daodejing (Rosenthal translation)
Zhuangzi
Liezi
Yijing part one
Yijing part two
The Art of War
Book of Five Rings
Islam
Quran & its Interpretations
Quran
The Interpretation of the meaning of The Holy Quran By Yusuf Ali
The Interpretation of the meaning of The Holy Quran by Pikhtal
The Interpretation of the meaning of The Noble Quran (Hilali & Khan)
The Interpretation of the meaning of The Noble Quran (Hilali & Khan) with Beautiful
Recitation of Mishari Rashid Alefasy *192mb file!!!*
Various

[The Mystics of Islam](#)
[The Tawasin of Manusr Al-Hallaj](#)
[What is ISLAM?](#)
[Islam Is... - An excellent book geared towards non-Muslims](#)
[Mere Islam, C.S. Lewis and the Betrayal of Christianity By Brandon Toropov](#)
[Islam is your Birthright](#)
[Islam at a Glance](#)
[The Religion of Islam](#)
[Islam Basic Principles and Characteristics](#)
[A Brief Illustrated Guide To Understanding Islam *4mb file*](#)
[Islam in Focus](#)
[Principles Of Islam](#)
[Do You Know This Man?](#)
[What They Say About MUHAMMAD](#)
[Prophethood in Islam](#)
[What They Say About THE QURAN](#)
[Who Wrote The Quran?](#)
[Categories: SpiritualityE-books](#)
[Navigation menu](#)
[Veritas Society](#)
[Main Page](#)
[Forums](#)
[IRC chat](#)
[Recent changes](#)
[Random page](#)
[Help](#)
[Search](#)
[Search](#)

[Tools](#)
[What links here](#)
[Related changes](#)
[Special pages](#)
[Printable version](#)
[Permanent link](#)
[Page information](#)
[Create account](#)[Log in](#)
[This page was last modified on 24 May 2012, at 16:02. Privacy policy About Veritas](#)
[Disclaimers](#)
[Powered by MediaWiki](#)
<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php?topic=4855.0>
[28 captures](#)
[5 Aug 2007 - 31 Jul 2019](#)
[Jul](#) [SEP](#) [Jun](#)
[14](#)
[2013](#) [2014](#) [2016](#)

About this capture
The Veritas Society

*

*[Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

September 13, 2014, 07:46:18 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

216037 Posts in 15387 Topics by 19879 Members - Latest Member: - Mr Rajo Most
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ [The Veritas Society](#)

| -+ [Academic Areas](#)

| | -+ [Articles](#)

| | | -+ [Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts](#)

| | | | -+ [Self Mastery](#) 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous
next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 4 [Print](#)

Author Topic: [Self Mastery](#) (Read 29677 times)

[Prophecy](#)

[Theurgist](#)

[Teacher Emeritus](#)

[Posts By Osmosis](#)

Posts: 1237

Karma: 74

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

[Self Mastery](#)

« on: November 02, 2004, 02:57:49 PM »

Self Mastery

Introduction

It is imperative to the metaphysicist, whether he be a magician, a psychic or a mystic, to conquer himself. Why? Because we must conquer ourselves before we can conquer that which we seek mastery of. "Know thyself" is the old axiom, and let it be extended to embrace "Know thine enemy." If you know your enemy, you can meet him in combat and emerge the victor. The power of the magician, of the mystic, the sage, the prophet, the psychic, the priest, over the outside world is only proportional to his control over himself. You must force your flesh and blood into submission to your mind, and then your mind into submission to your soul. Only then shall you be centered, and work as one unit not divided against itself. This is the resolution of the three conflicts of mind, body, and spirit.

The Animalistic and Divine Nature

"Not just another animal, not merely a product of evolutionary change, in a very special way the human spirit was touched by the hand of the Divine; Half beast, half God." -Mitsugi Saotome

Man is a unit simplistically made up of two main sides: The Divine and Animalistic dual natures. In one aspect, we are not but primates. We react according to genetics to a given event, have the same primordial reflexes as any other animal, are characterized in the most animalistic ways to continue our own reproduction, and our actions themselves are often governed by evolutionary genetics to which we are predisposed and behave only as our physical minds have evolved to behave in order to ensure successful mating and reproduction. We eat because we need food to live, have sex because we are compelled to carry on the species, nurture our young because they too must continue the species, expel wastes just like all other animals, and much more. This is us at our most primordial foundation: no different from the animals which we butcher.

The thing which separates us from the animals and makes us men is our polar divine nature, by which we have risen to a height of control over this world, and should we so seize it, power in even other worlds. We have a very real connection to the divine forces that govern and fabricate the universe from star to star, and pluck the very strings which resonate the songs of heaven and cries of Hell. The key, central force of our divine nature is the soul, which the animals do not have and wherein they are animals because of. It is the foundation of our godly selves, and the force by which we are exalted above the other animals of this world. However, this side of us is subdued by our animalistic instincts, and I weep as I look about and see not but a gloomy veil of dust over the soul's of men. They are animals to me, and deserve to be treated as such if it were my choice. Do not let the soul become vestigial, for vestigial parts are removed over time, and I fear for the man who loses his very soul because he did not use it.

The choice then is this: Shall we be animals, or gods? The goal of spirituality is to transcend the animalistic side and embrace the godly side of the self. To converse with the Higher Self, the Oversoul, and embrace the universe in its spiritual totality. This is the refining of the self, that we may destroy the beast that keeps us outside the gates of heaven, gnawing at our sides and scratching our fleas. However, this can not happen so long as we allow the animal in us to subdue the godly in us. In so far as we are naught but animals, we shall never realize our destinies as the sons of God. The goal of the mystic, the magician and the spiritualist is to transcend the animalistic and embrace the divine. In this manner the divine nature has control over the self, and therein we truly become ourselves (being divine by inheritance). So long as a man is divided against himself, he can not stand strong in the world of metaphysics. He shall speak to spirits, and they shall reply "Why has a dog come to speak with me? I do not waste my time with animals."

The Exercises

Now then, to the bulk of this essay: the exercises by which you may eventually come to be in control of your animal self. This is done by denying yourself the animalistic instincts that govern our lives in so far as those which are not necessary for your survival, demonstrating that your mind and not your genetic psychology is in control of yourself. Once this is done, spiritual meditation can reunite your mind with your inner self.

1.) The Overcoming of Habits. It is first and foremost important that you overcome various habits which you know are having a direct negative influence on your life. This could be smoking, drinking, twitching, coughing, burping, yelling, getting angry swiftly, or any number of things. Whatever it is, locate it and overcome. Do this gradually, setting time periods during which you will refrain from the habit. Start, perhaps, by going a day without embracing it. Move on to several days, then on to a week, etc, etc until you are no longer ruled by the habit. The first walls have been broken to in conquering yourself. Whenever you fail and submit to the habit, punish yourself accordingly, perhaps by refusing to eat a particular food for a day, not watching television, etc; be creative, but be firm in your discipline. A reward/punishment system is extremely useful for this.

2.) Eating control. Do not eat because you can, or because there is food in the area. Instead, eat only when you have to, and only enough to satisfy you until the next time you are scheduled to eat. Perhaps resign yourself from some of your favorite foods to demonstrate control over that part of you, and therein establish that you are in control, and not your appetite. You may even consider becoming a vegetarian for a matter of weeks (does not need to be permanent by any means). Do this same thing with drinks, only drinking when appropriate and never simply because you can. Drink more water and less soda, etc etc.

3.) Control of Movement. Take a gesture which you are accustomed to using on a daily basis (such as a wink, smile, hand gestures, etc) and do not use it for set days of the week, keeping to this schedule rigidly. If you catch yourself doing the gesture,

punish yourself accordingly(never be extreme in your punishments). If you usually sit cross-legged, sit with your legs out straight. If you usually lean to your right, lean to your left. If you walk quickly by nature, walk a little slower, and vice versa. Do not let instinctual habits of physical movement control you, and monitor everything you do accordingly throughout your day, looking for what little things you can gain control over. This is the mastery of your movement, that you may do nothing without a purpose.

4.)Control of Speech. Monitor your very speech. Avoid saying words that you typically use in every day language, paraphrasing where need be, no matter how odd it may make you sound. Do not let the routine conformities of speech which society has engraved into your mind rule you, but instead rule all things about your speech, that nothing you say will be said without a reason, and that you may never say anything which has no benefit. Avoid speaking idly of useless things which have no benefit to yourself or the listener, and do not insult, yell or curse, for these are the manifestations of animalistic rage. If a question is asked of you, answer it concisely and to as accurate a degree as need be. Do not babble on about a subject after it has adequately been covered.

5.) Control of Thought. This is essential in meditation, and just as it can aid your meditation, so can meditation help you towards this end in a mutual effect. Monitor your thoughts closely throughout the day, trying your hardest not to let your mind wander on pointless things. Choose something that you usually find yourself thinking about during the day(perhaps a girl/guy you like) and try not to think about it though out the course of the day. Each day go on trying to suppress and control such streams of thoughts, so that when you need a focused mind it is not cramped with the trash that the average person lingers on.

6.) Make a new ritual. Establish a new routine for each day; something that is not a part of your usual schedule, and will require its own separate amount of attention on a regular basis. A good example would be buying a plant that requires constant nurturing, such as a small bonzai tree. Whatever it is, make sure you stick to it with all the fervor of an important religious rite. Do not swagger in your dedication to this daily routine, but do not let it control you either. After a matter of weeks, get rid of it.

7.) Control of Personality. If you are subject to the horrible idiocy that is the mainstream scale of popularity, then go against the grain a little. If you are one of the popular jocks, start spending some time with the "unpopular" people that you would have normally never considered even being around. The inverse should be applied to the people that the social ladder does not favor in regards to being kind to others that you typically would pass a rude glare to. Do not let the conformity of the social world force you into obedience. Dogs are forced into obedience, not gods. If your actions bring a little social scorn upon you from those you fancy to be your friends, know that it is all part of the test upon the completion of which you are not ruled, but can begin to rule.

8.) Sleep Control. Establish a mentally controlled biological clock for yourself. On

weekends that you don't have things planned for the morning, try waking up at about 8:00 with no alarm clock. This can be accomplished by enforcing in your mind the previous night that you WILL wake up the next morning at 8:00. In this way you gain even a subconscious control over natural psychosomatic responses.

9.) The Destruction of Niceties. If you are accustomed to sleeping in a fluffy bed with warm blankets and a comfortable pillow, do away with it in favor of something more simplistic, though perhaps not more comfortable. Do not take warm showers (this does not mean they have to be freezing), avoid your favorite foods, and bring yourself to do things that you usually would not do in a lack of dedication (such as begin going to your church or temple every Sunday, etc). If a place you need to go is walking distance away, and you have spare time, then walk there. If you have someone clean your house, begin cleaning your own house. Be creative.

I have here provided a descent list of ways to gradually gain conscious control of the usually subconscious and/or instinctive facilities which tend to govern our lives. Following through with these is not simply a step forward in the spiritual path towards embracing personal godhood, but also an extraordinary act of self discipline which can only reflect positively not only all areas of metaphysics, but all areas of life.

Above all, be creative. I've only given you nine little exercises you can put into practice, some taken from the Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius, some from Liber III vel Jugorum (expanded upon by myself), and some from my own walk of life in so far as they have proven beneficial in my discipline. Expand upon these yourself, always looking for the little things which seem to govern you, and turning the tables so that you govern it. If you can conquer yourself, you are one step closer to conquering this life.

Logged
<http://www.thedivinescience.org>
Vinncent
he-who-posts-lots
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 372
Karma: 0

Nobody

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #1 on: November 02, 2004, 03:36:17 PM »

This was a very useful article. And since St. Ignatius is the saint of our school, I might as well post the prayer we say everyday;

Lord, teach me to be Generous;
To give, and not to count the cost.
To fight, and not to heed the wounds.
To toil, and not to seek for rest.
To labor, and not to ask for reward,
Save that of knowing, I'm doing your will.

I think this applies to mastery of the self.

Logged

\\\"Only a fool quotes himself\\\" - Vinncent

The history of the world is but the biography of great men.

Koujiryuu

Scholar-Warrior

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1328

Karma: 106

內功。導引

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #2 on: November 02, 2004, 08:00:39 PM »

Another well written, excellent piece, applicable to any kind of creed or practice. You must master yourself before you can master your surroundings. This should be mandatory reading for every aspiring metaphysical practitioner.

Logged

My Articles

玉雲寺 - TNM Archive

impossibleFork

Frequent poster

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 117

Karma: 4

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #3 on: November 03, 2004, 04:08:33 AM »

How can you possibly say that animals do not have souls and at the same time suggest vegetarianism? I feel quite considerably repulsed of this statement if I have interpreted it correctly: could you clarify your definition of soul, do you by that mean consiousness or are you refering to an some other concept, such as some form of true essense of being?

Logged
martijn
Regular Member
Settling In
*

Posts: 49
Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #4 on: November 03, 2004, 04:45:36 AM »

* Some things in this article are a bit extreme, but it's not for the exercises in themselves, it's for the general idea of practising discipline*. I thought i was free of nasty habits, but *, no. I put a * for everytime i deleted a ..., my nasty habit. and capital letters.

It's got some good ideas though.

Logged
Prophecy
Theurgist
Teacher Emeritus
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1237
Karma: 74

Veritas Teacher

View Profile

Self Mastery

« Reply #5 on: November 03, 2004, 12:42:38 PM »

The article served more as a proposal of practices I've gathered from various resources(two of which are listed) which have traditionally been practiced by saints and sages alike. In our times these no doubt seem extreme, but neither do I see many saints about this world today. Regardless of their harshness, as you may label it, they are efficient means of self discipline.

I consider the soul the internal godhood by which man was given the divine right to be masters of this world. It is, to me, what separates man from animal, and is not simply "consciousness."

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Alhireth-Hotep

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

Posts: 121

Karma: 2

Hundred-plus Club

View Profile

Self Mastery

« Reply #6 on: November 03, 2004, 01:25:04 PM »

An excellent article, and one with which I disagree completely. We are strongly embodied creatures, and intelligence comes from the interactions of our bodies with the environment. If there are 'higher' planes than the physical and 'higher' selves to match, this applies equally to them. We are not dualistically divided; we are dynamic systems.

Logged

vashts

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 92

Karma: 1

Regular Member

[View Profile WWW](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #7 on: November 04, 2004, 12:44:36 PM »

Can my first act be not to accept this verbatim?

Logged

! UNDER CONSTRUCTION !

Please refresh the page

Prophecy

Theurgist

Teacher Emeritus

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1237

Karma: 74

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #8 on: November 04, 2004, 12:47:36 PM »

Sure.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

vashts

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 92

Karma: 1

Regular Member

[View Profile WWW](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #9 on: November 04, 2004, 04:56:46 PM »

Thanks.

Logged

! UNDER CONSTRUCTION !

Please refresh the page

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 4915

Karma: 166

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #10 on: November 05, 2004, 08:13:55 AM »

This article seems to advocate a path of self-mastery which goes from physical to mental to spiritual. In the path of psi I have often advocated a path of self-mastery which goes from mental to spiritual to physical. Regardless of the specific ordering you undertake, gaining precise and willful control over yourself is not only essential for spiritual development and progress in metaphysics, but also for the pursuit of a meaningful life. Good article, Prophecy.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #11 on: November 21, 2004, 03:04:34 AM »

A strange article. The Introduction began so well, but The Animalistic and Divine Nature resulted in conflicting reactions in me. On the one hand, I felt it to be harsh, almost crude, underneath the well-written words, but on the other hand I understood generally where you were coming from and agreed. I suppose it could be likened to the whole 'ends justifies the means' concept. I agreed with the conclusion and what you were aiming to suggest, but found the ideas behind it strange and disagreeable at times. =/

((More to come, reply too big))

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #12 on: November 21, 2004, 03:07:13 AM »

Outside of that though, I found the exercises incredibly good. However, as I took down these exercises for a reference I thought up of ways to expand on some of them when I deemed them lacking (the sleep one for example, I quickly thought up things such as if you are usually someone who gets up early in the morning, try to sleep in, or vice versa. I know a few people with very distinct sleep habits which they should learn to avoid). So a few more things could have been added in, but that much. What I was actually surprised to see not mentioned was the whole sexual pleasure thing. This being probably one of the few things you could almost classify as addictions which almost all people suffer from. I think people should also take note of this.

((more to come))

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #13 on: November 21, 2004, 03:09:48 AM »

Being a teenager in a disgusting class I have had the misfortune of becoming involved in some dirty conversations. One I happened to overhear was a few guys talking about how often they masturbate. Someone admitted to at least two times a day. If anyone else happens to be like him on this forum (which I would hope they aren't), I would consider this something you may want to work on. I think this is definately something a lot of people, mainly teens, would benefit from if they are able to master. Just a little thought. =)

Despite all that, it still recieved 4 stars, as it happened to be very, very, very good. =P

((Note: My apologies for having 3 replies. But I had already written it all, and didn't want it to go to waste. =P I hope this isn't too much of an inconvenience.))

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Prophecy

Theurgist

Teacher Emeritus

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1237

Karma: 74

[Veritas Teacher](#)

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #14 on: November 21, 2004, 07:43:24 AM »

"Expand upon these yourself, always looking for the little things which seem to govern you, and turning the tables so that you govern it. If you can conquer yourself, you are one step closer to conquering this life. "

I very much encourage that people expand upon the given exercises, finding which facets of it they may.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Pages: [1] 2 3 4 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

===> Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C4855.15.html>

14 captures

17 Nov 2011 - 26 Aug 2019

Aug SEP Oct

20

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

September 19, 2014, 10:15:17 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

216157 Posts in 15391 Topics by 19888 Members - Latest Member: - timejourney

Most online today: 111 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ Academic Areas

| | -+ Articles

| | | -+ Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

| | | | -+ Self Mastery 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 Print

Author Topic: Self Mastery (Read 29719 times)

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #15 on: November 21, 2004, 09:24:41 PM »

Ah. I must have skipped that at the end by accident. My mistake. =P

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Raven

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

**

Posts: 67

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #16 on: November 26, 2004, 07:18:25 AM »

Ah, beautiful Prophecy, just outstanding. Btw, does music apply to these subconscious interferences?

Logged

Im going to keep wearing black until there's something darker...

Prophecy

Theurgist

Teacher Emeritus

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1237

Karma: 74

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #17 on: November 26, 2004, 02:41:42 PM »

Music can, yes.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Koujiryuu

Scholar-Warrior

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1328

Karma: 106

內功。導引

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #18 on: December 06, 2004, 06:18:12 AM »

Jus to expand on kobok's comments, I think the progression I would advocate would be mental + physical = spiritual, if that makes sense. In any case, this is still a great piece.

~Kouji

Logged

My Articles

玉雲寺 - TNM Archive

Hech

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1153

Karma: 14

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #19 on: May 04, 2005, 08:56:22 PM »

One word: Fantastic.

If one thinks this is to "harsh", maybe its just the wake-up call they need.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

NightSpirit

Greenhorn

New Member

*

Posts: 3

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #20 on: May 04, 2005, 09:27:53 PM »

Nice article. One only needs to step outside their comfort zone to truely be free of their fears....then take their first steps to self mastery!!

Logged

fompin

Greenhorn

New Member

*

Posts: 3

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #21 on: May 10, 2005, 07:25:49 PM »

so, i hav a question... HOW ru supposed 2 "punish yourself"?? in my opinion, u r tellin people the rong thing. they could misinterperate in a BAD, BAD way... i kno sum that dont want to slip bak in2 hurting themselvs:(... but, any way, all im sayin is, try 2 b more

careful next article & think of the readers. im not trying 2 b mean.... really. the concept of the text i liked.

Logged
Prophecy
Theurgist
Teacher Emeritus
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1237
Karma: 74

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Self Mastery

« Reply #22 on: May 11, 2005, 06:07:51 PM »

No offense taken my friend. I purposely avoid even mentioning self-inflicted physical harm, mentioning a few far less damaging but still efficient substitutes. While the original system of discipline upon which this article is based(that of St. Ignatius) did call for cutting yourself as a reminder, I am personally very much against self mutilation and do not see how it could be of more benefit to the magician than a simple probation from an enjoyable activity.

Logged
<http://www.thedivinescience.org>
[Lotus]
Regular Member
A Veritas Regular
**

Posts: 59
Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #23 on: July 13, 2005, 05:11:33 PM »

I agree with most of what you said prophecy, all except the soul thing. I believe it is our intelligence and rationality that make us more able than animals. I dont think a soul has

anything to do with the goals of these excercises. Is it not our minds that benefit from such excercises?

Logged

As a lotus flower is born in water, grows in water only to rise out of water and stand above it unsoiled, so shall I, born in the world, raised in the world, having overcome the world, one day live unsoiled by the woRld

Svatejasaa

Veritas Teacher

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 418

Karma: 21

formerly Mindwarp

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #24 on: August 10, 2005, 07:32:23 PM »

Quote

I believe it is our intellegence and rationality that make us more able than animals. I dont think a soul has anything to do with the goals of these excercises. Is it not our minds that benefit from such excercises?

Yes, and no: Our soul and mind benefit from it. The point of these exercises is to deny the Ruach, or the ego, so that it may be offered up in sacrifice to the Higher Self, or Holy Guardian Angel; thus the magician may experience that great moment known as "Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel," called by some the realization/acceptance of the Christ etc. Also, making this Ruach more complete so that it is more suitable for the Holy Guardian Angel to manifest in can be necessary for some. This, of course, is from the Theurgical/Hermetic point of view, and this concept can be further seen in the grimoire "The Book of the Sacred Magic of Abramelin the Mage."

It is not our intelligence and rationality that makes us more able than animals: in many religions even, it is accepted that "Man was created in the image of God" or that Man is in fact a child of God. This indicates that man is above all else, that he is the microcosmic universe, which is his soul or piece of God, just as God is the macrocosmic universe. In The Tree of Life Regardie avers that mentally deficient people have near the same chance at receiving Truth, in some cases even more, than even the brightest scholar; Sublime Understanding can't be described by logic alone. Therefore, the reason the entities will not speak with animals is not because of their lack of intellect, but rather their lack of soul.

« Last Edit: August 10, 2005, 07:35:13 PM by Mindwarp » Logged
<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Biznut
Greenhorn
Settling In
*

Posts: 19
Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery
« Reply #25 on: September 19, 2005, 09:44:23 AM »
Wow, another great article Prophecy Smiley

Good job ^_^
Logged
Apricot
A Familiar Feature

Posts: 137
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery
« Reply #26 on: March 22, 2006, 08:59:23 AM »
I want to give you deep thanks for this article, I don't know how I managed to stumble past it without seeing before.

Recently, prior to reading this, I was making a log of my day in which I would include anything I did which I felt was "animalistic" and then set goals to counter these actions.

However after reading this article I think I will discontinue my little journal in favor of a different system. I'd like to draw up a schedule encompassing possitive and negative behaviours in this light which I can mark my successes with. In addition to this schedule I think it would be nice to include healthier practices like more regular exercise.

I especially like how you mentioned mastery of the mind and body... how should I say it, I think that because you work on these together in a way it sort of.. urges each other along. In that it's hard to master the mind if your body is fed poorly and too much and you are distracted by every itch that comes by, and it is hard to master the body if you have immoral thoughts constantly swimming through your mind.

I hope I can put these exercises to work. Howe'er I too have a question about reward/punnishment and about subconscious interferences.. I'm not quite sure what either of these encompass

Thanks again

Apricot

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Trillis

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1234

Karma: 15

. . ::IAO:: . .

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #27 on: March 23, 2006, 02:13:01 PM »

How...Odd? I hadn't realised this article existed until now.. huh

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

thoth

New Member

*

Posts: 2

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #28 on: July 20, 2006, 07:17:39 PM »

i am appaled by the idea that animals do not have souls...

but thats the christian in you talking

think about the more earthly magicks, such as the native american medican men. for them-every animal, every plant, every rock, every storm has a soul.

but i see this has already been adressed, wo i will not make a huge post about it

Logged
Wonderland
Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #29 on: April 19, 2007, 10:45:26 PM »

Speaking as someone who embraces vegetarianism, Native American (Indian) religions, Christianity, the belief in the power of stones, storms, etc., I would like to suggest that, perhaps, as it is used herein, the word "animal" does not, necessarily, refer to animals. I think it is more metaphoric in its usage.

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 [Print](#)

[« previous](#) [next »](#)

Jump to:

==> Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C4855.30.html>

14 captures

17 Nov 2011 - 26 Aug 2019

Mar JUL Jul

21

2013 2014 2016

[About this capture](#)

The Veritas Society

*

*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 20, 2014, 05:22:23 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

215052 Posts in 15326 Topics by 19768 Members - Latest Member: - catalin Most
online today: 91 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Academic Areas

||-+ Articles

|||-+ Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

||||-+ Self Mastery 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous
next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 Print

Author Topic: Self Mastery (Read 29170 times)

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

View Profile

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #30 on: April 19, 2007, 11:53:38 PM »

No, I believe it's quite literal.

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #31 on: April 20, 2007, 03:51:21 AM »

You make a good point, in a very general sense. I just wrote out a bunch of stuff [in this post] that would make sense to fundamentalist Christians and deleted it. There probably aren't very many people so indoctrinated reading this article to the end and need to have their "hands held".

Though I would ask you, Tsumaru, if you don't mind, what is the significance behind your screen name? I have read many of your posts and am curious. Feel free to respond via PM if this is too personal a question for general eyes. I apparently haven't gotten the concept of PM down very well as of yet. I thought it meant postmodernization? rolleyes

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 3290

Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #32 on: April 20, 2007, 07:18:33 AM »

"I would like to suggest that, perhaps, as it is used herein, the word "animal" does not, necessarily, refer to animals" By the typical scientific definition of animal, humans are basically included in the categorization. It's when psychology or religion throw their definitions in that there are differences.

From dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/animal>

Quote

an·i·mal /'ænəməl/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[an-uh-muhl]

Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

–noun

1. any member of the kingdom Animalia, comprising multicellular organisms that have a well-defined shape and usually limited growth, can move voluntarily, actively acquire food and digest it internally, and have sensory and nervous systems that allow them to respond rapidly to stimuli: some classification schemes also include protozoa and certain other single-celled eukaryotes that have motility and animallike nutritional modes.
2. any such living thing other than a human being.
3. a mammal, as opposed to a fish, bird, etc.
4. the physical, sensual, or carnal nature of human beings; animality: the animal in every person.
5. an inhuman person; brutish or beastlike person: She married an animal.
6. thing: A perfect job? Is there any such animal?

–adjective

7. of, pertaining to, or derived from animals: animal instincts; animal fats.
8. pertaining to the physical, sensual, or carnal nature of humans, rather than their spiritual or intellectual nature: animal needs.

[Origin: 1300–50; ME (< OF) < L, n. deriv. (with loss of final vowel and shortening of ā) of animāle, neut. of animālis living, animate, equiv. to anim(a) air, breath + -ālis -al1; E adj. also directly < L animālis]

From wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal>

Quote

Characteristics

Animals have several characteristics that set them apart from other living things. Animals are eukaryotic and usually multicellular (although see Myxozoa), which separates them from bacteria and most protists. They are heterotrophic, generally digesting food in an internal chamber, which separates them from plants and algae. They are also distinguished from plants, algae, and fungi by lacking cell walls. All animals are motile, if only at certain life stages.

So the use of the term "animal" in the article to refer to the non-divine portion of mankind's being is quite literal.

~Steve

Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 766
Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #33 on: April 20, 2007, 10:38:45 AM »

Man is, at least from the physical perspective, merely a highly evolved animal. The ability to concentrate on a certain point on a wall for many hours at a time is in itself, while not apparently practical, a far more advanced use of concentration and attention than can be seen manifested by another animal.

The word "animal" can be used in the sense of a metaphor:

More "animalistic parts of the soul," for example, is synonymous with the literal "vulgar parts of the soul." The soul is not an animal nor is any part of it an animal, but the term "animalistic" is suitable to term vulgar areas in contrast with those erudite as vulgarity, being lower than piety, can be paralleled with an animal and man.

It may also be used as a literal word. An animal is physically, and from what is observed, mentally lower than a human being. Therefore, "animals, not gods" can be used to compare animals literally with humans as gods or metaphorically to show the animalistic areas of the soul and the more "pure" ones.

Either interpretation suffices.

Logged
Tsumaru
Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780
Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #34 on: April 20, 2007, 10:16:00 PM »

Quote from: Wonderland on April 20, 2007, 03:51:21 AM

Though I would ask you, Tsumaru, if you don't mind, what is the significance behind your screen name? I have read many of your posts and am curious. Feel free to

respond via PM if this is too personal a question for general eyes. I apparently haven't gotten the concept of PM down very well as of yet. I thought it meant postmodernization? rolleyes
Haha, postmodernization. I actually chuckled out loud at that one.

Anyway, there is no secret nor significance to my username. In fact, I've spoken about it a number of times. Here is an interesting topic:

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php?topic=7699.0>

In a nutshell though, I just basically pulled it out of my ass because I wanted something Japanesey sounding. I had no idea it was a real Japanese word at all when I made it. Is there something that you consider to seem significant about the name/word?

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

View Profile WWW

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #35 on: April 22, 2007, 11:12:06 AM »

Tsumaru, I guess it's a good thing you pulled it out of your ass, cuz it must have been "plugged up". I chuckled out loud at that one, myself. When I first came to Veritas, I never read any chat stuff until after I registered, so I had an impression of you being a young, androgynous, martial arts warrior. FYI - I use androgynous like yin and yang, not in a "bad" way, though I figure you already know that. To me, it is a compliment, and I hope it is to you, too. Just by spelling I associated it with tsunami, which, when you think about it, is also something one gets as a result from being clogged or plugged up. It works on all levels! I love it when I think I made something up and it turns out it has a very interesting significance, after all. There are no coincidences.

Also, thanks to Oriens L.L., for putting my vague ideas into a much clearer and more informative post. Sometimes I just think I know everything. wink

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #36 on: April 23, 2007, 12:14:23 AM »

Quote

When I first came to Veritas, I never read any chat stuff until after I registered, so I had an impression of you being a young, androgynous, martial arts warrior.

shrugs I try not to put too many classifications on myself. You'll have to ask someone who knows me better whether that really adds up or not. I'd like to think there's a bit more to me than two adjectives and a noun though. =P

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #37 on: April 25, 2007, 12:22:08 PM »

No doubt. I would hope so, too. I was just going off of the icon and name at the time. That was then. As for now, I am still just learning, so...how does "totally hot and in control" sound?

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

queen of the south

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 526

Karma: 1

WTF?????

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #38 on: August 08, 2007, 06:03:26 AM »

And there I was thinking all this time that I have been trying to klose weight all my life!
But behind the facade of this innocent looking diet In actual fact I was learning how to
master myself!!!!

Incredible!!!! cool

Logged

Changing your mind will change the world,World
peace,Love,Happiness,Health,Abundance-these things are obtainable right here,right
now.

Draconic Feathers

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 436

Karma: 3

You are Me and I am You; I'll always Be with You

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #39 on: March 18, 2008, 04:11:34 PM »

Logged

Following our Will and Wind, we may just go where no one's been

Solve et Coagula

Continue Expanding Consciousness...

aeresvistaas.daportfolio.com

Robin

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1002

Karma: 32

Your friendly neighborhood Verigeek.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #40 on: April 03, 2009, 09:46:03 AM »

I've got a question about point 5:

The IIH of Franz Bardon said something similar, like 'thinking about your work when you're at work and home when you're at home.'

My question is, would it be a problem to think about things in your spiritual/magick development during these 'mundane' activities?

Because since I've been working with Magick and Yoga, I tend to think about it the whole day, even when I'm at school and doing my homework.

So, would this be a problem for my concentration, and should I really be able to stop thinking about these things?

~Tempestum

Logged

Draconic Feathers

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

Posts: 436

Karma: 3

You are Me and I am You; I'll always Be with You

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #41 on: April 03, 2009, 10:18:47 AM »

Quote from: Tempestum on April 03, 2009, 09:46:03 AM

I've got a question about point 5:

The IHH of Franz Bardon said something similar, like 'thinking about your work when you're at work and home when you're at home.'

My question is, would it be a problem to think about things in your spiritual/magick development during these 'mundane' activities?

Because since I've been working with Magick and Yoga, I tend to think about it the whole day, even when I'm at school and doing my homework.

So, would this be a problem for my concentration, and should I really be able to stop thinking about these things?

~Tempestum

Depends...is it hurting your practice? Can you not help but constantly think about such things? Does it bother you when you try not to? Test yourself

Logged

Following our Will and Wind, we may just go where no one's been

Solve et Coagula

Continue Expanding Consciousness...

aeresvistaas.daportfolio.com

Rawiri

Wandering Nomad

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 918

Karma: 42

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #42 on: April 03, 2009, 02:29:12 PM »

Quote

Because since I've been working with Magick and Yoga, I tend to think about it the whole day, even when I'm at school and doing my homework.

So, would this be a problem for my concentration, and should I really be able to stop

thinking about these things?

Yes. If your mind can easily go to one focus - but then cannot remove from it and attach to something else...then your mind is not controlled. It is just running along a new groove of concentration you have formed for it, beyond your control. Being able to focus your mind on your so called "mundane" affairs is grounding, and prevents you being to airy-fairy headed. The only time you can EVER make a decision is when you are living in the now, and daydreaming about things not here yet (or already done) - unless deliberate and earnest thought - is a waste of your 'mental resources.' There are some cases when you might add a 'thought' that you want to always be going on, such as the idea of everyone being an aspect of God in karma yogis. But even then, there should be control. At the moment, you are a slave, not a master. And "the slaves shall ever serve."

Logged

Dancing_Crow

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 636

Karma: 12

Jai Guru Deva Om

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #43 on: November 10, 2010, 07:50:34 PM »

I would substitute the phrase/mental construct "animal" for machine. In my belief system, animals have souls and as such are just as capable of being my teacher as any other animal out there. (humans included).

Machines on the other hand don't have souls. I may have the spelling wrong but I believe the Russian Mystic Gurdjireff talked about the "robots" or "machines" within us needing to be purged.

Are you a man or a machine?

Logged

"Allow the beauty and grace of what you love BE what you DO and KNOW."

Mindlessinvalid

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1205

Karma: 10

Crazy and Can't Get out of Bed

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #44 on: November 11, 2010, 01:31:28 PM »

animalism refers to that which compels you, rather than you compelling it.

To be animalistic is to give into your desires, machines don't have desires by your reasoning and therefore are unsuitable for this analogy.

I can direct you to some psychological studies showing how animals let certain factors such as food or comfort compel them. It just makes the analogy we're using all the more valid.

Logged

Clothes make the man, and naked people have little or no say in society.

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 [Print](#)

« [previous](#) [next](#) »

Jump to:

====> [Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C4855.45.html>

17 captures

17 Nov 2011 - 26 Aug 2019

Apr JUL Jul

21

2013 2014 2016

[About this capture](#)

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

[Did you miss your activation email?](#)

July 20, 2014, 05:19:45 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

215052 Posts in 15326 Topics by 19768 Members - Latest Member: - catalin Most
online today: 91 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Academic Areas

||-+ Articles

|||-+ Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

||||-+ Self Mastery 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous
next »

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] Print

Author Topic: Self Mastery (Read 29169 times)

Robin

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1002

Karma: 32

Your friendly neighborhood Verigeek.

View Profile

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #45 on: November 12, 2010, 10:56:11 AM »

If we are to call the neurologically-programmed urges in animals 'desire', it would only
be fair to call the programmed urges in machines the same thing.

Logged

Wren

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1711

Karma: 32

View Profile

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #46 on: November 12, 2010, 08:38:50 PM »

I'm going to throw down with Maslow on this one. The Pyramid of Needs seems like the saner option when compared to the various iterations on the theme of "angel on the right shoulder; devil on the left." The me that seeks to continue living by procuring food and shelter is simpler, more vital, and less "socially restrained" than the me that seeks self-actualization. Does that mean that it is bad to want to eat and that I should become a Jain Saint by starving myself while reciting mantra for the sake of all sentient beings? Some would say so; a few have even done so, but in this case I'm more willing to adopt the biological android simile from recent psychology. The levels of the pyramid are just like levels of priority and as the priority increase, so does the drasticness of response possible to elicit. "The Machine Inside" becomes simply a set of subroutines that may be evoked in the improper places to do things they were not built to do thanks to funky coding, but they aren't evil alien space-demons. We can re-code to make the habitual sub-routines more efficient at doing their job, freeing up processing space for the important stuff, like Life, the Universe, and Everything, while the sub-controllers keep the Doritos input constant. It's even possible to fiddle with the priority settings, but like always, the factory settings are the only ones tested to avoid crashes and latent bugs waking up and flying into the vacuum tubes.

Viva Metaprogramming. Viva Magic.

I don't know a lick of code, so if my jargon got me eaten by a grue, I'll happily edit to save face. wink

Maybe Mercury is having his way with my speech patterns? *shrug*

« Last Edit: November 12, 2010, 08:59:29 PM by Wren » Logged

Dancing_Crow

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 636

Karma: 12

Jai Guru Deva Om

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #47 on: November 13, 2010, 07:50:54 AM »

Quote from: Wren on November 12, 2010, 08:38:50 PM

I'm going to throw down with Maslow on this one. The Pyramid of Needs seems like the saner option when compared to the various iterations on the theme of "angel on the right shoulder; devil on the left." The me that seeks to continue living by procuring food and shelter is simpler, more vital, and less "socially restrained" than the me that seeks self-actualization. Does that mean that it is bad to want to eat and that I should become a Jain Saint by starving myself while reciting mantra for the sake of all sentient beings?

Some would say so; a few have even done so, but in this case I'm more willing to adopt the biological android simile from recent psychology. The levels of the pyramid are just like levels of priority and as the priority increase, so does the drasticness of response possible to elicit. "The Machine Inside" becomes simply a set of subroutines that may be evoked in the improper places to do things they were not built to do thanks to funky coding, but they aren't evil alien space-demons. We can re-code to make the habitual sub-routines more efficient at doing their job, freeing up processing space for the important stuff, like Life, the Universe, and Everything, while the sub-controllers keep the Doritos input constant. It's even possible to fiddle with the priority settings, but like always, the factory settings are the only ones tested to avoid crashes and latent bugs waking up and flying into the vacuum tubes.

Viva Metaprogramming. Viva Magic.

I don't know a lick of code, so if my jargon got me eaten by a grue, I'll happily edit to save face. wink

Maybe Mercury is having his way with my speech patterns? *shrug*

I like this metaphor and approach. I think that's what I was really trying to say - thanks for reading my mind. Smiley

Logged

"Allow the beauty and grace of what you love BE what you DO and KNOW."

Wren

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 1711

Karma: 32

[View Profile](#)

Re: Self Mastery

« Reply #48 on: November 13, 2010, 06:44:07 PM »

What are cyborgs for if not to utilize advanced algorithmic processing sequences in order to accurately map complex hypothetical situations in a manner indistinguishable from functional augury? Smiley

Logged

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

==> Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=4848.0>

8 captures

7 Jul 2007 - 1 Aug 2015

Oct SEP Aug

14

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

*

[*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

September 13, 2014, 07:46:13 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

216037 Posts in 15387 Topics by 19879 Members - Latest Member: - Mr Rajo Most online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ Academic Areas

| | -+ Articles

| | | -+ Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

| | | | -+ Understanding Basic Human Needs (by LadyKalee) 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: Understanding Basic Human Needs (by LadyKalee) (Read 14066 times)

Article

Veritas Teacher

New Member

*

Posts: 6

Karma: 0

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Understanding Basic Human Needs (by LadyKalee)

« on: August 24, 2004, 09:44:08 PM »

Originally written by LadyKalee.

UNDERSTANDING BASIC HUMAN NEEDS!

ABOUT BASIC HUMAN NEEDS

“All judgments are tragic expressions of unmet needs”. Such a profound statement and yet so true. We as human beings all have basic fundamental needs in which must be fulfilled to some degree for us to be able to function reasonably well in society, and for our well being and continued growth. These needs are physical as well as psychological. Unfortunately through our parents and society, most of us have learned to try and get our needs met through Judgments, Criticisms, Diagnosis, Interpretations and telling others all the things they are doing wrong. Which in many cases aren't very productive because it really does not address what the actual needs are. You certainly know what it is that you don't want, but what is it that you really need. There are many different ways for needs to be met. Needs can either be met CONSTRUCTIVELY or DESTRUCTIVELY.

MEETING NEEDS CONSTRUCTIVELY AND DESTRUCTIVELY

When needs are met constructively, it means that when something happens to fulfill a person's needs, usually other needs are fulfilled as well. Or at least, other needs are not frustrated. The constructive fulfillment of basic needs lead to continued growth of a person and the inclination to care about and help other people.

Whenever a need is not fulfilled, it leads to a feeling of frustration of the person and the needs. The destructive fulfillment of needs means that the actions to satisfy a person's need, leads to the frustration of other needs. Or actions to fulfill a person's needs, harm other people and frustrate the satisfaction of other people's basic needs. When needs are persistently frustrated, people are likely to turn to destructive need fulfillment. This happens because frustrated needs make people desperate to do whatever they can to get their needs met. They lose the ability to weigh consequences and make good judgments. People will abandon their ethics, morals and values to meet their needs. It is that important.

TRAUMATIC EXPERIENCES ON BASIC NEEDS

Traumatic experiences usually frustrate human needs. Most traumatic experiences frustrate the need for security. They lead people to believe the world is a dangerous and that people are dangerous. Traumatic experiences make people feel vulnerable and

that they can't protect themselves.

Traumatic experiences frustrate the need for positive identity. People feel diminished, worthless. People feel that something must be wrong with them, otherwise such a terrible thing would not have happened to them.

Traumatic experiences frustrate the need for effectiveness and control. When people are unable to protect themselves or their family, they feel less effective and less in control. They may also become aggressive and feel unable to control their behavior toward others.

Traumatic experiences frustrate the need for positive connection to other people. It leads to mistrust and disconnection from other people. It can lead people to see others as separate and hostile to one self.

Traumatic experiences frustrate the need for comprehension of reality. It destroys a person's understanding of the world and their place in the world. The world seems not normal, not a reasonable, moral, or predictable place. A person can become obsessed with asking, "WHY"

Traumatic experiences often lead to destructive satisfaction of one's needs. Why do people fight and argue. They fight and argue when they don't get what they want. And what you want is determined by what you think you need. People may choose aggression to make themselves feel secure, even when there is no real danger. Power and aggression are used to gain a feeling of effectiveness and control. Control is so important in some traumatized people they feel they have to be alert at all times and exercise control even when it is not needed.

Part of healing from the trauma involves finding constructive ways to satisfy our basic human needs. The key is being able to identify what the needs actually are. Also once you have identified what your needs are, looking at the destructive ways you are getting them met, And then finding constructive ways to meet them. Now we will take a look at many of the basic human needs.

SECTION 1

DEFINING BASIC HUMAN NEEDS

The human body is a complex creation that science and medicine still doesn't fully understand. There are four relationships in life.

Physical Needs – Purpose and Joy

Social Needs – Love and Recognition

Mental Needs – Hope

Spiritual Needs – Peace and Faith

The first is our physical relationship with our environment and basic needs of the human body. The second is the social relationship with other human beings and the needs of the heart. The third is our relationship with ourselves and the needs of the mind. And the fourth is our relationship with God and the unseen spirit world, the needs of the soul. Each of these relationships is very important to our health and happiness. Which means that all needs of these four relationships must be satisfied. Looking at the person as a whole and no part can go unattended if true health and happiness are to be achieved.

PHYSICAL NEEDS

Our body is the house we live in while on earth. It will grow and it will die. Then we will move out of our physical body to a different kind of existence. It's a temporary house where we live for only a short period of time. Thus the reason our earthly bodies are the least important part of our make up. Physical survival needs such as food, water, air, clothing, sex, health, income and shelter are well understood and much of our time is devoted to these survival needs. But there is another physical need just as urgent and important but less recognized. It is the need for Self Fulfillment, which can be defined with the words Purpose and Joy. It is most important for every person to find the true purpose for their life and experience the joy when they fulfill that purpose. This basic human need satisfies our physical existence. This answers the questions "Why am I here and what is my purpose in life". A person needs a reason to get out of bed in the morning, a purpose in life, something meaningful and constructive. When that purpose is not defined we become frustrated, depressed or despondent. The symptoms in which are revealed in our behavior. Although home, family and career are important priorities. They cannot satisfy the full purpose of our existence. Once our life's purpose is recognized and fulfilled, and then all the other priorities will fall into place. Until then, life is unsettled, dissatisfying and incomplete. Fulfilling the true purpose for which we were born is the single, most urgent propriety to our personal happiness.

NEEDS OF THE HUMAN HEART

The "Heart" most people are familiar with is the organ that pumps blood through our bodies. The heart is also the center of our emotions and feelings towards others. It is from our hearts in which we relate to other human beings. And this is what identifies the "Social" part of our make up. Just like the physical part of our make up which has certain needs that must be fulfilled, the social needs are crying out to be satisfied as well. The needs of the heart can be summarized in two words Love and Recognition. The number one fear of all people is rejection. And the number one need of all people is Acceptance. Simply stated, every person needs to feel loved, recognized and accepted as a worthwhile human being for this need to be fulfilled.

NEEDS OF THE HUMAN MIND

The human mind is a very private place, the most private in our human experience. It is the place where no other person can go and is a very powerful part of our human

makeup. The mind is where we carry our relationships with ourselves. Just as the body and heart have certain needs that must be satisfied, the mind also has needs that are critical to a healthy thought process. Those needs can be summarized as one word Hope. When a person has hope, life is good. And when hope is taken away, life can be very difficult. The mind is capable of good and evil thoughts that can be constructive or destructive to our entire future. It is like a battlefield where fight most of life's battles. A person with hope will show it through energetic, positive, successful pursuits, but without hope our ambitions become dead in the water. Hope depends on the belief that everything is going to be OK. It must look beyond the current circumstance with expectation and confidence, Even when the current circumstance is threatening and challenging... Hope doesn't require proof, it requires trust. And Hope can only be as strong as the amount of trust we have.

NEEDS OF THE HUMAN SOUL

The soul is the most valuable part of our human existence. It is the spiritual part of us that will live forever, long after our physical bodies have returned to earth. Like the other parts of our makeup, which have certain needs that need to be satisfied, the soul has those needs as well. These needs can be summarized in two words Peace and Faith. Both of which are essential for spiritual health and happiness. Human beings were created to believe in the existence of a Higher Power, and to trust in the Higher Power explicitly. This pure and simple belief, trusting in the Higher Power creates an inner peace as nothing else can.

MASLOW'S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS

Another version of our basic human needs was created by Psychologist Abraham Maslow. He grouped various motivating needs into five categories.

PHYSICAL NEEDS:

There are certain physical needs that apply to our biological bodies. Such as Income, health, shelter, food, air, water, sex and sleep. We spend much of our lives fulfilling these needs as for our bodies are the vessels which house our souls. Without these needs being met, we would not survive physically. Physical safety is an essential need.

SECURITY NEEDS:

Safety and security is the most basic of psychological needs. It is the belief that we are safe from physical as well as psychological harm. We need to feel that we can protect ourselves as well as our love ones from danger, attack, etc. Continued employment and a healthy environment is another part of security.

SOCIAL NEEDS:

We need to have a positive connection and esteem for others. We need to feel acceptance, love and a sense of belonging. This means having close relationships with individuals and groups, intimate friendships, family ties, and relationships to the community. Recreation and entertainment are part of our social needs as well. We need to have comprehension of reality. We need to understand people and the world (what they are, how they operate, why people do what they do, why things happen the way they do). It is the basis for understanding our place in the scheme of things. Our comprehension of reality helps us create meaning in our lives. It can help us fit into the world and can help us to have a vision of how we want to live life, our values and morals.

SELF-WORTH:

Another basic human need is for a positive identity and self-esteem. This need requires us to develop and maintain a positive image of ourselves. A positive identity requires self-awareness and acceptance of ourselves, including our limitations. Our independence or autonomy and self-trust are also a major part of this. Having the ability to make one's own decisions and choices as well as being not only connected, but separate. It means trusting one's own judgment and perceptions and having the desire to achieve.

SELF-REALIZATION:

This need includes personal growth, higher education, the drive to realize and utilize one's potential capabilities, the desire to contribute to the betterment of mankind. This also includes our spirituality including transcendence of the self. This becomes increasingly more important as we get older. We as human beings have the need to grow and expand our horizons.

SECTION 2

ANTHONY ROBBINS; THE SIX BASIC HUMAN NEEDS

Motivational speaker Anthony Robbins has another version of our basic needs. He has them divided into six different categories. Everything we experience in life is driven by our emotional needs. There are four different classes of experiences in which we experience on a regular basis.

Something that feels good, and it is good for you and others, and serves the greater good. These are the peak experiences in life. This is also the experience when all our needs are being met at once.

Something that does not feel good, but is good for you and others, and serves the greater good. These experiences are the secret to a joyous and fulfilling life.

Something that feels good, but is not good for you and others, and does not stand for the greater good. These are the experiences that we do everyday in our lives that prevents us from moving forward.

Something that does not feel good, and is not good for you and others, and does not stand for the greater good. These are the experiences that come from fear and old habits.

No matter where you live in the world our basic human needs are the same. Some may have different priorities depending on where you live. Getting your needs met can be very difficult at times. The key once again is being able to identify what your needs are. As Mr. Robbins points out is that our needs are constantly in conflict. They create a Paradox. A Paradox is when two things appear to be in conflict but are actually complimentary. And this can be very confusing at times. But understanding how these needs are in constant conflict can help you understand why you do the things that you do. The first need is.

THE NEED FOR CERTAINTY/COMFORT

We need to feel certain that we can feel comfortable. The most fundamental need is that we can avoid pain and gain pleasure. This our basic survival need. For most people certainty equals survival, it's that important to our lives. If you want to have certainty, you need to make sure that you have quality information and that you apply your faith. When you are feeling really uncertain in your life, you reach for something that you can predict that will be certain. There are many different ways in which to meet these needs, negative ways and positive ways. Negative ways are very seductive. They are the experiences that feel good, but are not good for you. These are the class three experiences. What do most people do when they need certainty, they reach for food, anything that will give them certainty that they are familiar. Things that they feel will give them control. They can control other people. Avoid a large challenge by doing something small that they can control, like choosing to clean your car instead of paying all the overwhelming bills. Some people try to achieve it creating consistency. Creating a set routine. Those don't seem to be very productive as to the world and everyday life is changing to rapidly. Some people create a negative identity for themselves. Some positive ways are to create a positive identity for yourself and having complete faith in the circumstances. Most people try to meet these needs by creating an artificial vehicle such as money and relationships. They think if they have enough money or the perfect relationship then they will be happy. So what happens when you become totally certain, well you are confident for one, you lose your edge, you don't grow as a person. When you totally satiate a need you become unhappy. So when you become totally certain you become BORED! And this brings us to the second basic human need.

THE NEED FOR UNCERTAINTY/VARIETY/SURPRISE

The second need is in direct conflict with the first one. This is the paradox. Every human being has the need for uncertainty. You don't just want it, you don't just desire it, you

might try and avoid it, but you absolutely need it. Other ways to describe this need is diversity, challenge, surprise, unpredictable and difference. And from this need is where all the excitement in life comes from. Lets look at relationships for example. At first in the relationship you are uncertain as to what it will bring. And your certain about the uncertainty. Meeting both of the needs. After awhile you can totally predict what the other person will say or do. Then total certainty is achieved. So what happens when you are totally certain, you become bored. Then you start looking for ways to create uncertainty. Some negative ways in which these needs can be met are that you can start working more, decide that you are with the wrong person because your bored, you can start cheating, you can start arguments. All of these ways can create variety and uncertainty. Other negative ways are to indulge in drugs or alcohol. All of these negative ways as well as others are very seductive. Because they feel good when your doing them, but it creates more pain for you and others. The class three experiences. Some positive ways to meet these needs in relationships could be that you travel, start new and interesting conversations, create variety in your sex life. So no matter who you are, or what you do, or who you are with, there is always variety in a positive way, if you are willing to look for it. So when your totally certain, you are bored, and when your totally uncertain your freaked out. Hopefully now you can start to see how these needs are in constant conflict. The paradox, two things that appear to be in conflict but are actually complimentary. A delicate balance must be achieved to have these needs met together. Which brings us to the third human need.

THE NEED FOR SIGNIFICANCE

Other ways to describe this is to be needed, to feel importance, to have purpose, unique and different. This is the emotional need that drives all human beings. Keep this in mind, whatever human beings do they have a reason. And whatever they do they believe that either consciously or subconsciously, it's going to meet one of their needs. Even if it hurts other needs, it's going to meet one of their needs. If we can learn to recognize what drives us, then we can find positive ways to get the most out of our needs, and not just getting that temporary relief as from the class 3 experiences. The most important way that women feel significant is they need to be needed, and for men the most important way is to feel important. They both have these needs. The importance just varies from men and women. Some negative ways to meet the need for significance is to tear everyone else down, violence is a way to gain instant significance, create a negative identity, illness. Some positive ways are learning, knowing the answers, a different and unique style, eccentric, family, children and money. Remember, if something works in your life to fulfill a need, whether it is a positive or negative way, especially on the subconscious level, you will do it over and over again. So what happens when you feel totally significant, well in order to feel totally significant you have to be different. And this violates the fourth basic human need, which is

THE NEED FOR CONNECTION/LOVE

This is what we all really want and need. It is what the human soul yearns for. So when

you are totally significant, different and unique. This separates us from other people as well as the connection with people. Once again you see the constant conflict that these two needs have. We want so badly to feel significant, unique, and when we get that we wonder why we don't feel fulfilled. It's because we don't feel that same level of love and connection. Some negative ways to feel connection are sympathy, getting sick or injured, violence, crime, and joining a gang. Some positive ways to feel connections are join a club, organizations, family, friends, relationships, sexuality, spirituality, pets, nature, self sacrifice, teams and appreciating beauty and art. So let's look at the relationship example again. You meet this special person, everything is great, you are really excited, this person notices you, they really love you, and you feel really significant. Then the relationship progresses, and we tend to start feeling less significant. This person still loves us, but they just don't give us the same level of attention as before, and not enough for us to be fulfilled. So we start to look for ways to make us feel significant again. Keep this in mind, when you demand significance, you rarely get it. So you have this relationship and it's so wonderful, you feel so connected, you have this total connection, it feels like we're one soul, and then all the sudden someone says "But who am I". If I am you, and you are I, then who am I. I don't have my own identity. So then you go out and try to create your own identity and then sure enough, the next thing you know, you are alone again. But now I don't feel that connection. You see the paradox. This is why we see the same problems over and over again. They just have different strategies to meet these needs, but the same problems. People just don't understand how these needs are constantly in conflict. People try and meet their needs, and usually meet them very weakly. On a ten scale they are a two, three, or four. They are not satisfied enough to be really happy, and yet they're not dissatisfied enough to change. Isn't that a scary place to be. You can meet these first four needs and still not be totally fulfilled, cause you also have to meet the next two needs as well. The first four needs are our basic fundamental needs. The last two are our essential and primary needs that must be met for us to be totally fulfilled as a person, and the way you approach the first four needs determines how fulfilled you will be with the last two. The next need is

THE NEED TO GROW

It is essential for us to grow as humans. Everything in life is either growing or dying. There is nothing in between. We all must serve a purpose. We can't be happy or fulfilled unless we are constantly growing. Next is

THE NEED TO CONTRIBUTE

We all have the need to go beyond ourselves. We all know how good it feels to do something that we don't have to do, and we do it anyway, not expecting anything in return. It's a feeling like no other. We as humans all have the need to contribute to the greater well being of people and our society. Everything must serve a higher purpose or the greater good of it will not last, including you.

So what have we learned so far.

People will violate their beliefs, values, and morals to meet their needs

When you find something that is fulfilling, you are driven to do it, and you will do it over and over again whether it is positive or negative.

You've got to be aware of what the needs are and what is driving them, especially the negative ways so that you can find productive ways to meet them

When some one is at peak performance they believe that all six needs are being met at once.

These six needs must be met with all people and interactions in order for us to feel fulfilled.

Negative ways of fulfilling needs can be very seductive as they feel good at the time, but does not serve our greater good.

The secret to a happy and fulfilling life is to avoid class three and four experiences and to convert class two experiences into class one

You can meet these first four needs in destructive ways and feel a little fulfilled, just enough that you are really not happy, but not dissatisfied enough to change, and you will not be fulfilled and happy, cause you will not grow and contribute.

SECTION 3

A MORE IN DEPTH LOOK AT HUMAN NEEDS

Each of us has the same human needs, but the priority and importance of the needs varies from person to person. When a people do not get their needs met, they can become frustrated, and turn to negative strategies to meet their needs. We shall now take a look at different needs and how they manifest in peoples lives both positive and negative ways.

SECURITY

Security is the need to feel safe, to feel assured that they know what is going to happen, to know ahead of time what the plans are. What constitutes security is different for different people. Examples of how security manifests in peoples lives are

Having lots of money in the bank

Having a planned savings/retirement program

Having a secured job

Having a house, home and family

Having a dependable car

Paying off a mortgage/no debts

Having personal and family health

Having life and health insurance to protect their family

Having personal faith in god

Carrying a gun

Living in a gated community

Living near family and friends

Relationships

Positive aspects: When meeting the need for security in a positive way it tends to make you feel safe, balanced, grounded, connected, safe, secure, and trusting that things will be ok in life.

Negative aspects: Meeting the need in a negative way tends to make you overly cautious, fearful, paralyzed, indecisive, frozen in place, unable to function due to insecurity, retaliation against someone who they believe destroys their sense of Security.

People who have the need for security will be more deeply affected by sudden changes, unforeseen events, real or perceived threats to their jobs, their livelihood, of their sense of self. Their fear will keep them from functioning in times of crisis or potentially cause them to react strongly to someone that they feel is threatening their sense of security. People with the need for security are more likely to work for someone else than entrepreneurial endeavors. People who have a low security need will tend to welcome changes and new situations.

ADVENTURE

Adventure is the need for an adrenaline rush, to have new experiences, to travel, to have BIG experiences, to have drama in their life, to have a sense of anticipation about upcoming events. Some examples are

- Planning new trips (even if they are not taken)
- Extreme sports
- Starting a new company
- Moving frequently
- Changing jobs frequently
- Changing partners or spouse
- Buying a new car every year
- Being an entrepreneur
- Conquering something
- Experimenting with new techniques and materials
- Being the first to do something or try something
- Loving the challenge of solving problems
- Race car driver

Positive aspects: Meeting the need in a positive way gives you a Sense of higher self-confidence, independence, risk-taking, optimism, excitement, enthusiasm for living.

Negative aspects: Meeting the need in negative way can give you a reckless regard for life and limb, irresponsibility, cutting themselves off from people (hermit), judgmental of others who are less adventurous, creating crisis or drama inappropriately.

People with the need for adventure will lead the pack to find new things to do, new places to visit, new markets to open, new ways of doing things. They make excellent sales people. If things get too boring, they will find a way to liven them up, either in a positive way by initiating a new way or in a negative way by going off on their own, taking great risks or by criticizing others who can't see that the new adventure is wonderful.

There is a conflict between people who have the need for security and adventure that creates a lot of havoc. Some people have both security and adventure as their main needs. This creates a challenging situation in which it seems to be contradictory. To handle it appropriately, one might enjoy traveling to new places, (adventure) yet will carefully plan out the trip, (security), satisfying both needs in a positive way. If they might find themselves constantly in conflict between the two. If they realize they are responsible for meeting their own needs, the conflict can be managed in a positive way.

FREEDOM

Freedom is the need for independence and spontaneity. It is also the need to have choices and to feel in control of making those choices. Many people might have the need for freedom that goes along with adventure. People with the need for freedom will tend to partake in more adventurous venues. Freedom does not care for plans of heavy structure. Some examples are

- Having choices and making their own choices
- Feeling free to move around without restrictions
- Feeling free to make choices on their job
- Making choices about relationships
- Choosing where they live
- Refusing to obey rules that were created by others
- Advocating freedom as a basic human right
- Keeping their options open, not making decisions
- Re-arranging their home or office
- Unique way of dressing, hair style, appearance
- Feeling free to be themselves no matter what the situation
- Searching for their own answers, rather than others' opinions
- Refusing to make a commitment
- Emotionally unavailable

Positive aspects: Meeting the need in a positive way will tend to give you the feeling of independence, self confidence, high self esteem, teaching others, clarity

Negative aspects: Meeting the needs in a negative way can lead to relationship avoidance, fear of commitment, separation and distancing from others, inability to understand others and be understood, manipulative (imposing on people's freedom), martyrdom (feeling stuck, trapped, or sorry for your self)

People with the need for freedom may resist any and all attempts to impose new rules on them. They need to be in an environment where independent thinking and spontaneity can be rewarded. They make good teachers of people who are expected to exercise independent judgment. If you are around people with the need for freedom you will get along best with them if you recognize and respect their need to make choices for themselves. If you have the need for freedom must recognize that need in yourself, and not put yourself in situations that are very rule oriented, rather you must look for situations where your freedom can be exercised appropriately.

EXCHANGE

Exchange is the need to trade information and knowledge with others, not just to mingle or socialize, but to deliver and receive something of value. That something of value may be information, conversation, energy, friendship, services, money, gifts, love, justice, shared experiences. People with the need for exchange are concerned about the flow of energy in all types of relationships. They like to see things moving in some way that expresses balanced equality, integrity, and equal exchange. Some examples are.

Participating with others in all types of discussions

Staying in touch with friends, family (phone calls, letters, e-mails, in-person visits, gifts, etc)

Feeling like a team with co-workers

Working with others who have a common goal

Participating in clubs, teams, committees

Seeing justice done

Feeling a sense of integrity and trust with others

Sharing and receiving information

Studying situations relating to ethics, integrity and justice

Sharing a deep relationship with another person where they feel able to communicate and interact freely and easily

Building and maintaining an active network of contacts

Positive aspects: Meeting the need for exchange in a positive way can be a good role model for relationships, maintaining an equal balance in a relationship. Keeping things moving (knowledge, information, communication, energy). Promoting equality in interactions, contracts, ethics, integrity, balance

Negative aspects: Negative meeting of the needs can lead to keeping secrets, lying, withholding communications, gossip, criticism, cynicism, general negativity, stinginess, not participation with others in an equal or balanced way, unethical behavior

People with the need for exchange get along well with others who have a common goal. If they can't find a common interest they tend to write off that person and it's challenging for them to continue any further interaction with that person. People with the need for exchange need to feel they are giving and receiving something of value for other people. They will be very frustrated with unethical behavior or learning that something

has been withheld from them.

POWER

People with need for power need to be in a position of authority and responsibility. They need to explore power, leadership and accomplishment. They tend to be good organizers and accept responsibility, setting an example of leadership. Some examples are

- Managing a company
- Becoming a leader of an organization or professional group
- Organizing events trips projects
- Achieving success
- Helping others feel empowered
- Being a well know speaker
- Writing a book on leadership
- Being responsible for things, projects, events, situations
- Being recognized as a leader
- Teaching others about leadership and responsibility
- Taking command of a military unit
- Taking charge in an emergency or crisis

Positive aspects: Meeting the need for power in a positive way and leave you with self-empowerment, positive leader role model, sense of accomplishment, success, feeling of being organized and responsible

Negative aspects: Meeting the need in a negative way will tend to show abuse of power, dictatorship, inappropriate control, anger, manipulation, violence against other people

People with the need for power will gravitate to situations that allow them to exercise their leadership skills and responsibility. This may be on a grand scale or on a smaller level. When they cannot exercise their need for power, they may become manipulative through coercive power, threats or over-control. A person with the need of power may exercise it in the work place, find outlets in a community setting, or in a teaching others about the use of appropriate power. These people may be noticed when they walk into a room because they carry a strong sense of leadership. These are good folks to put in charge when something needs to get done. They are happiest when they feel powerful. They are unhappiest when something prevents them from exercising power in some way of they feel a sense of personal failure.

EXPANSION

Expansion is the need to build something, to add onto, to create an empire, to expand horizons, to go where no man has gone before, to grow as a person. Some examples are

- Building a company

Building a personal and political empire
Personal fortune
Expanding a collection (art, rare books, etc)
Building new buildings, roads, cities, communities
Discovering new ways of doing things
Expanding boundaries of science, art, medicine, music or nature
Learning new physical and spiritual things
Seeing the bigger picture
Exploring uninhabited lands or regions
Becoming a minister and preaching about spiritual connection
Creating new breeds of animals or plants
Discovering ones self

Positive aspects: Getting this need met in a positive way brings on growth and expansion within yourself and you mind, recognizing the value of others, recognizing the value of art, science, nature, physical and spiritual laws, recognizing a connection with great spiritual leaders (Christ, Buddha, the higher self), working with the study of intuition and psychic interests, understanding how the universe works and how they fit into it, understanding themselves and others.

Negative aspects: Meeting this need in a negative way can bring about indiscriminate growth (cancer, huge weight gains, hoarding things, large collection of odd things), confusion, loss abandonment, betrayal, loss, suicide, atheism, evil, sin, spiritual separation

People with the need for expansion will constantly be trying to expand their knowledge and the boundaries of that knowledge. This is good if they can focus they're energy on assisting the growth of a company, or as in their own personal expansion and growth. If they're need for expansion is thwarted, they may have the tendency to take from others to fulfill that need and turn to inappropriate and harmful ways as well.

ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance is the need to accept yourself and be accepted by others. This includes a feeling of belonging. People with need for acceptance are usually very easy going and pleasant to have in a group. Some examples are

Being accepted by neighbors
Being accepted in a club or group
Feeling a sense of acceptance by co-workers
Working with people who need extra attention
Feeling loved
Doing things that make others feel good
Being nice regardless of the person or situation
Being tolerant of self and others
Accepting whatever comes up in life
Being accepted as a valuable member of a family group

Positive aspects: Meeting this need in a positive way can bring about understanding and participating in love and loving situations, romance, bondedness, sense of family or tribe, self-esteem, self-forgiveness, forgiveness of others, humanitarian ways.

Negative aspects: Meeting this need in a negative way can leave you feeling rejected, jealous, prejudice, guilty, shameful, hate, group prejudice and fear of different classes of people.

People who have the need for acceptance are a valuable addition to any group. They will often be a stabilizing presence and help others tolerate each other a little better. They may go along with whatever proposals are made to avoid conflict in a group. It's very hard for them to express any different opinion because of their fear of being rejected. They need to feel accepted as well as accepting others. They can be seen as a doormat with no opinion of their own or their time may be abused since they will rarely criticize others or say no. When rejected by others it causes them more severe pain because of their high need for acceptance.

COMMUNITY

People with a need for community like having people around. They are highly social and will express their enjoyment of gatherings. These are the best folks to put in charge of parties or company gatherings. They will seek out people and have large number of relationships. The need for community is different from the need for exchange in that community does not require exchange of any kind. Some examples are

- Throwing parties for the slightest reasons
- Being the center of the office network
- Participating in classes, groups, clubs
- Going to a mall or a concert just to be around people
- Being the cook for a large family gathering
- Hosting family gatherings, groups or friends
- Opening their home to people from out of town
- Running for public office
- Gathering signatures for a petition
- Creating a learning center
- Being a part of a campaign

Positive aspects: Meeting this need in a positive way makes you highly social, the ability to have and relate to children, grandchildren, distant relatives, the need for family, bonding at a higher level, responsible citizen, sense of ones own importance and dignity in relation to the rest of humanity

Negative aspects: Meeting this need in a negative way brings about neediness, clinging, dependence, irresponsibility, criminal behavior, short term thinking.

People with the need for community will be with people every chance they can get.

They may be the center of a gathering or on the sidelines. These are people that do not respond well when they are isolated or working the midnight shift. Because socializing is such an innate talent with them, others may feel jealous and not understand the high need to be with other people. Not every one has an inherent need (or even tolerance) for very high social contact. The less social folks may want to tag along occasionally, letting those with community gather the crowds.

EXPRESSION

Expression is the need to be artistic, to be seen, to be heard, to be felt. It is the need to express oneself through words, speech, actions, dress, art and self-creations of all type. Some examples are

- Creating websites, writing newspapers, creating graphic art
- Writing books, articles, poems
- Reading poetry at a coffee house
- Public speaking about something close to you
- Creating art in all forms
- Teaching creative thinking classes
- Coaching children in creative arts
- Dancing in all forms
- Acting in movies, plays, and local theaters

Positive aspects: Meeting this need in a positive way can show in individual creativity, showing balance, getting in touch with ones own creativity, being a living expression of “Who am I”

Negative aspects: Meeting this need in a negative way can lead to invasion of other people’s space (too much self-expression), self-centered, temperamental, blind to other’s value, lying, creating or expressing a false image.

People with the need for expression will be happiest when they are free to express their inherent creativity. If a person with this need is rigidly controlled or monitored, this could lead to this person inability to function.

SUMMARY OF HUMAN NEEDS

A human being is a complex creation of body, heart, mind and soul. Our total health is dependent on meeting each of our needs, and as long as we can find constructive ways to meet our needs we shall continue to grow as human beings. To avoid fulfilling one of our needs will have an adverse effect on our total health and happiness as well as others in which we are involved. No human need can go unsatisfied without suffering the consequences. Thus the pursuit of all human beings is to recognize and satisfy the true needs of human life so that our relationships in our life will be healthy and gratifying. This involves the true meaning and purpose in life, hope that is will all turn out OK, finding love and acceptance, and placing our faith in a higher power who is capable

of bringing total inner peace to the uproar of life on earth. Remember that healing of trauma and victimization involves finding constructive ways of satisfying our basic human needs. Talking to others about what your needs are, how they affect your life and how they affect your interaction is a valuable exercise to gain more understanding about yourself. Remember, give that what you wish to receive, and you won't have to worry about receiving.

Much of the information was repeated several times on purpose. The more times we hear what our needs actually are, the more likely we are to be able to identify what drives us to do the things that we do. Good luck!

SECTION 4

EXERCISES

Now comes the fun part. Putting what you've just learned into action. It's time to start identifying what drives you to do the things that you do. Looking at the positive ways and the negative ways in which you are meeting your needs.

- 1) From section two, the Anthony Robbins version of basic human needs. Think of something that you do that makes you really happy. Write down all the six basic human needs, (certainty, uncertainty, significance, connection, growth and contribute), and underneath the words draw a box, and with the zero to ten scale, ten being the most fulfilled, write in the boxes underneath the words, the amount of the level of fulfillment for each of the needs.
- 2) Now think of something that you don't like to do, but is necessary in your life for you to do, and do the same as above. This would be a class two experience. Find out the level of fulfillment you feel with this task.
- 3) Think of something in your life or a need in your life that you satisfy destructively. Design a strategy to satisfy this need in a constructive way.
- 4) From section 4, read through the list of needs, determine which of these are the highest priority in your life and which are the lowest. Rank each one of the needs from one to nine, One being the highest priority. Group the needs in groups of three's, (three highest, three middle, three lowest)

For each one of the top three needs, think about how your life has been driven to satisfy those needs in a positive ways

Now think about how those needs have been met in destructive ways

Ask yourself this question, "What is happening in your life today that satisfies your highest needs.

Are your strongest needs not being satisfied in constructive ways, if not, what changes can be made to meet your needs in a constructive way

Think about people that are closest to you, what are their highest needs and how do they rank. How do they meet their needs either positively or negatively

BONUS EXERCISE

To get the most out of this exercise, if you are not ready to do this one, please don't read through it, it takes the shock, reality and surprise out of it. Take out a piece of paper, write every thing you want in person or significant other, I mean everything, even down to the most-tiny detail. (hair color, integrity, kind of shoes, eyes, honesty, favorite color) I mean every little thing. You should end up with a list of about 30 – 50 items on your list.

Next. I repeat, if you are not ready to for this exercise, turn back now before its to late. Take the list that you have, and mark through all the things that are not that important, and you could probably live without.

Next. Again. Please turn back if your not actually doing this exercise. Now go back to the list. And mark through everything that you can live without. Leave only the items that you absolutely must have to have a happy relationship.

So what is this all about. These last few remaining items that you absolutely must have in your life for a happy relationship. In order to have these things, you must be those things yourself. No exceptions or variances.

Be Good To Yourselves Elephant

Courtesy of my friend Linn ;}

Logged

AngryLeprachaun

Freelance Leprechaun

Posts By Osmosis

Posts: 555

Karma: -1

VERITAS LEP

[View Profile](#)

Re: Understanding Basic Human Needs (by LadyKalee)

« Reply #1 on: September 19, 2006, 07:17:00 PM »

Very inspiring post, however I only had really skimmed over it, I felt that it was thorough

enough to be called an A+ paper!

-AngryLep-
Logged
...:Believe:...
Kravockian
Settling In
*
Posts: 32
Karma: 0

spirit risen

[View Profile](#)

Re: Understanding Basic Human Needs (by LadyKalee)

« Reply #2 on: May 17, 2007, 06:48:42 PM »

Very good and interesting, there seems to be one thing missing though. What about the destructive need, if I missed it I apologize but sometimes a person simply needs to vent some negative and destructive energy and emotions be it through rant to a friend or actually damageing something. Once agian I apologize if I over looked it and it is a good article. A+ lol

-Kravockian
Logged
it's not about getting what you want, it's about wanting what you got.
Pages: [1] Print
« previous next »
Jump to:
==> Spirituality and Philosophy of the Arts

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:E-books>

80 captures

14 Jun 2006 - 7 Oct 2025

Apr JUN Jul

23

2018 2019 2021

[About this capture](#)
[Help](#)

Category:E-books

CategoryDiscussionView sourceHistory

"This is an online index of eBooks that any Energy Artist may wish to obtain. All the eBooks are free and in the public Domain.

The idea for this came to me when seeing the Bob Hendricks Memorial CM Library on [www.OccultFourms.com] and after seeing the Sacred Magick website fall victim to bandwidth strangulation. I figured veritas could use a Library for each of its varied subjects. A post will be made in Psionics, Body Energy Arts, Magick and Spirituality after I find enough files to make a decent post. I would Like to Thank Bob Hendricks for his phenomenal Library and the inspiration to spread the information via this Index, God rest his Soul." Taken from The Magick eBook Index Thread by Adept

These are our e-book indexes. If you read a book which has no summary to the right of it, please return and add a summary when you are finished.

Pages in category "E-books"

The following 6 pages are in this category, out of 6 total.

B

Body Energy Arts eBooks

M

Magick eBooks

P

Psionics eBooks

S

Spirituality eBooks

V

V-Library

W

Wanted ebooks

Category: Books

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 5 February 2006, at 09:45. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Category:Philosophy>

20 captures

2 Jan 2007 - 4 Sep 2019

May JUL Sep

05

2016 2019 2020

[About this capture](#)

[Help](#)

[Category:Philosophy](#)

[CategoryDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

This category lists all of the philosophy pages.

Pages in category "Philosophy"

This category contains only the following page.

A

[Age of Enlightenment](#)

[Category: Categories](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)

[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 15 September 2005, at 23:04. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#) [Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

http://vsociety.net/wiki/Age_of_Enlightenment

9 captures

12 May 2008 - 22 Jul 2014

Jun JUL Aug

22

2013 2014 2015

[About this capture](#)

[The Veritas Society](#)

[Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Recent Changes](#)[Random Page](#)[Help](#)

[Go to Page](#) [Go to Page](#)

[Log in / create account](#)

[Page Discussion](#) [View source](#) [History](#)

[Age of Enlightenment](#)

The Age of Enlightenment was a philosophical movement during the 18th century in which the guidance of reason and rationality were given preference over the doctrines of tradition. Along with this movement came a shift toward empiricism as a source of truth, and a rejection of ideas or knowledge which are not empirically testable.

During the Enlightenment period, some philosophers adopted a rational approach to spirituality, and attempted to use reason to replace, augment, or explain traditional doctrine. Other philosophers adhered more strongly to empiricism, and rejected religious doctrine. These two schools of thought resulted in a philosophical divide between mysticism and empiricism, causing the two to develop in parallel, but with much less contact than previously. The rise of Parapsychology toward the end of the 19th began a convergence of reasoned spirituality with scientific empiricism.

[Categories:](#)

[Philosophy](#)

[Logic and Science](#)

[Toolbox](#)

[What links here](#) [Related changes](#) [Special pages](#)

[Veritas License 1.0](#)

This page has been accessed 2,080 times.

This page was last modified on 15 September 2005, at 23:02.

[MediaWiki](#)

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Mysticism>

22 captures

15 Sep 2006 - 28 Aug 2016

Jun JUL Aug

02

2013 2014 2015

About this capture
The Veritas Society
HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp
Go to Page Go to Page
Log in / create account
Page Discussion View source History
Mysticism

Mysticism is the experience of a divine union with a "higher power", or the knowledge gained by such a union. Mysticism can also refer to the belief in a non-physical reality, or a part of reality beyond ordinary perception, and often considers this non-ordinary aspect of reality to be central to existence.

Categories:
Spirituality
Religion
Toolbox
What links here Related changes Special pages
Veritas License 1.0
This page has been accessed 3,243 times.
This page was last modified on 15 September 2005, at 23:08.
MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Parapsychology>
50 captures
2 Jul 2006 - 3 Sep 2019
May JUL Sep
25
2013 2014 2015

About this capture
The Veritas Society
HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp
Go to Page Go to Page
Log in / create account
Page Discussion View source History
Parapsychology

Parapsychology is the scientific study of mental abilities which interact with the physical world without the use of the physical senses or the physical body, itself. The phrase parapsychological abilities is often abbreviated as psi, and so parapsychology is often referred to as the study of psi phenomena.

For a thorough overview of the scientific evidence supporting psi, read "The Conscious Universe" by Dean Radin, or consult his list of journal articles and books. Another place you can start reading papers overviewing the research is this list of papers provided by

Jessica Utts, or this list by Daryl Bem. For a 2010 review of the Ganzfeld experiments, and some insight into the academic debate about psi, read this paper by Lance Storm et al. For an overview of early work in the field of parapsychology, read "Extra-Sensory Perception After Sixty Years", written in 1940 by Joseph B. Rhine [1].

The Parapsychological Association, an affiliate of AAAS, has prepared an extensive introductory FAQ about parapsychology.

Contents

1 Research Institutes

2 Professional Organizations

3 Parapsychology Journals

4 Reference Lists

Research Institutes

Cognitive Sciences Laboratory

Consciousness Research Laboratory

Rhine Research Center

The Monroe Institute

Professional Organizations

Parapsychological Association

Society for Scientific Exploration

Society for Psychical Research

American Society for Psychical Research

Parapsychology Journals

Journal of Parapsychology

European Journal of Parapsychology

Journal of the Society for Psychical Research

Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research

Journal of Scientific Exploration

Charles Tart Consciousness Library

Reference Lists

Bibliography from Conscious Universe

Meta-analysis papers from Jessica Utts

Articles overviewing major evidence by Daryl Bem

Experimental Evidence Summary, by Deborah Delanoy -- An overview of several meta-analyses of parapsychology research

Survival After Death -- a list of articles, transcribed from various experts in Parapsychology and Spiritualism.

Rupert Sheldrake -- Homepage of a biologist and author; he reports several experiments into psychic and unexplained phenomena.

Victor Zammit: Lower Presents Case for the Afterlife

Parapsychology and Psi -- Links to scientific papers on these subjects.

Scientific Papers by Dr. Montague Ullman

Bibliography of Out-of-Body Experiences-- Over 2,000 bibliographic references to OBE and NDE.

Sunora's Scientific Studies page -- A diverse list of studies and news articles.

Category:

Psionics

Toolbox

What links here Related changes Special pages

Veritas License 1.0

This page has been accessed 23,892 times.

This page was last modified on 24 October 2013, at 09:37.

MediaWiki

<http://vsociety.net/wiki/Parapsychology>

50 captures

2 Jul 2006 - 3 Sep 2019

May JUL Sep

25

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

HomeForumsChatRecent ChangesRandom PageHelp

Go to Page Go to Page

Log in / create account

Page Discussion View source History

Parapsychology

Parapsychology is the scientific study of mental abilities which interact with the physical world without the use of the physical senses or the physical body, itself. The phrase parapsychological abilities is often abbreviated as psi, and so parapsychology is often referred to as the study of psi phenomena.

For a thorough overview of the scientific evidence supporting psi, read "The Conscious Universe" by Dean Radin, or consult his list of journal articles and books. Another place you can start reading papers overviewing the research is this list of papers provided by Jessica Utts, or this list by Daryl Bem. For a 2010 review of the Ganzfeld experiments, and some insight into the academic debate about psi, read this paper by Lance Storm et al. For an overview of early work in the field of parapsychology, read "Extra-Sensory Perception After Sixty Years", written in 1940 by Joseph B. Rhine [1].

The Parapsychological Association, an affiliate of AAAS, has prepared an extensive introductory FAQ about parapsychology.

Contents

1 Research Institutes

2 Professional Organizations

3 Parapsychology Journals

4 Reference Lists

Research Institutes

Cognitive Sciences Laboratory

Consciousness Research Laboratory
Rhine Research Center
The Monroe Institute
Professional Organizations
Parapsychological Association
Society for Scientific Exploration
Society for Psychical Research
American Society for Psychical Research
Parapsychology Journals
Journal of Parapsychology
European Journal of Parapsychology
Journal of the Society for Psychical Research
Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research
Journal of Scientific Exploration
Charles Tart Consciousness Library
Reference Lists
Bibliography from Conscious Universe
Meta-analysis papers from Jessica Utts
Articles overviewing major evidence by Daryl Bem
Experimental Evidence Summary, by Deborah Delanoy -- An overview of several meta-analyses of parapsychology research
Survival After Death -- a list of articles, transcribed from various experts in Parapsychology and Spiritualism.
Rupert Sheldrake -- Homepage of a biologist and author; he reports several experiments into psychic and unexplained phenomena.
Victor Zammit: Lower Presents Case for the Afterlife
Parapsychology and Psi -- Links to scientific papers on these subjects.
Scientific Papers by Dr. Montague Ullman
Bibliography of Out-of-Body Experiences-- Over 2,000 bibliographic references to OBE and NDE.
Sunora's Scientific Studies page -- A diverse list of studies and news articles.
Category:
Psionics
Toolbox
What links here Related changes Special pages
Veritas License 1.0
This page has been accessed 23,892 times.
This page was last modified on 24 October 2013, at 09:37.
MediaWiki

<http://aspr.com/jaspr.htm>
283 captures
18 May 1998 - 26 Nov 2025
Jul AUG Jan
13
2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Journal of
the American Society for Psychical Research
A scientific journal providing scholarly reports, research findings, discussions of
implications and applications of psychic functioning, and book reviews. This is one of
the core journals in the field.

Selected Articles from the Journal:

The Limits of Experimenter Influence on Psi Test Results: Can Any Be Set?
by Rhea White Vol 70 Oct, 1976 No 4
The Influence of Persons Other Than the Experimenter on the Subject's Scores in Psi
Experiments
by Rhea White Vol 70 Apr, 1976 No 2
A Comparison of Old and New Methods of Response to Targets in ESP Experiments
by Rhea White Vol 58 Jan, 1964 No 1
Journals

Correspondence relating to the Journal should be addressed to the Editor, American
Society for Psychical Research, 5 West 73rd Street, New York, NY 10023.

All material submitted for publication should be sent as an email attachment, preferably
in Microsoft Word, or alternately submitted in quadruplicate and typed or printed
double-spaced. Tables, footnotes, and references should be in the form used in the
Journal. Abstracts (125-200 words) must be submitted with all papers.

Unsolicited contributions will not be returned unless postage is provided.

Permission to reproduce or translate material published by the Society must be
obtained from the Author and from the Editor.

Responsibility for the contents of any article appearing in the Journal rests entirely with
the contributor and not with the ASPR.

JANUARY 1997 Volume 91 Number 1

Random Generators and Living Systems as Targets in Retro-PK Experiments

Helmut Schmidt

Mapping the Characteristics of Out-of-Body Experiences

Carlos S. Alvarado

An Experiment With the Alleged Human Aura

Loftur R. Gissurarson & Asgeir Gunnarsson

Reviews of Scholarly Books

Reviews of Popular Books

Random Generators and Living Systems as Targets in Retro-PK Experiments

Helmut Schmidt

ABSTRACT: PK efforts by one subject on two kinds of prerecorded time intervals were compared. One kind was provided by the durations of successive breathing cycles of a human subject. The other kind was computer generated, with the help of a true random number generator, such as to match the breathing cycles with regard to average length and variance. After the prerecording of the interval lengths, each interval received a random target assignment, long or short, specifying the direction of the PK effort. An audio feedback had a built-in inversion provision, however, so that the subject listened to tones of varying durations with the goal of always extending the durations of the tones. The subject succeeded in this task by purposeful PK missing by means of getting mentally and physically tense and then desperately attempting to shorten the tone intervals. With both kinds of intervals 20 sessions were held, each session containing 40 time intervals. The subject could not consciously distinguish between the two kinds. The PK-effect on the actual breathing intervals was significant with $z=3.17$ ($p=.00076$, one-tailed). The scoring on the other intervals was lower, $z=1.68$ ($p=.046$, one-tailed), but the difference is not statistically significant.

[Back to Top](#)

Mapping the Characteristics of Out-of-Body Experiences

Carlos S. Alvarado

ABSTRACT: It is argued that systematic research on the phenomenology of out-of-body experiences (OBEs) has been neglected. More could be done on the variety of OBE features, including incidence and description, and a consideration of changes during the same experience and between experiences. Another important line of

research is the study of variables that may moderate OBE content. This includes induction factors, interrelations of different features, and psychological variables. In addition, OBE features may be studied in regard to developmental issues and their change over time. A research program based on the above considerations will be useful to: (1) The development of empirically-derived definitions of the experience; (2) The development of typologies of the experience; (3) The development and testing of theories to explain the OBE; (4) The differentiation or association of the OBE from and to other states of consciousness and experiences; and (5) Help clinicians to deal with individuals reporting OBEs.

[Back to Top](#)

An Experiment With the Alleged Human Aura

Loftur R. Gissurason & Asgeir Gunnarsson

ABSTRACT: An experiment is reported here on the ability of special subjects to see the alleged human aura. The main import of the paper, however, lies in the fact that it provides the groundwork for future experiments. A thorough review of the relevant literature is presented, not only of parapsychology but psychology, psychiatry, and occult and traditional lore surrounding the human aura. The study involved two groups: an experimental group of 10 people who claimed to see the aura and a control group of 9 people not known to have seen the aura. Four 90 cm x 200 cm screens were placed in a row in a room facing the door. One experimenter (L. R. G.) guarded the participant. A trial consisted of the subject standing in the doorway and guessing behind which of the screens the second experimenter (A. G.), who served as the target person, was hidden. The door was closed between trials while A.G. moved to the next target screen in a random order. Instructions to the experimental group were to attempt to locate A.G. by auric emanations streaming out from behind the screen where he was hidden. Each session involved 40 trials, and each group completed 18 individual sessions, for a total of 36 sessions overall. Statistical analysis yielded nonsignificant results for both groups combined. The experimental group obtained 185 hits ($z=.43$, $p=.33$) and the control group 196 hits ($z=1.38$, $p=.08$). The subjects' phenomenology is discussed, and to guide future research, several ways of theorizing about the aura are reviewed, including an aura imagery model proposed by the authors.

[Back to Top](#)

Reviews of Scholarly Books

Experiences Near Death: Beyond Medicine and Religion

by Allan Kellehear

reviewed by James McClenon

The World of Ted Series: "Thoughtographic" Studies of an

Extraordinary Mind (2nd ed.)
by Jule Eisenbud
reviewed by Dan Benor

Life at the Edge of Science: An Anthology of Papers
by Beverly Rubik
reviewed by Michael Levin

Conscious Experience
edited by Thomas Metzinger
reviewed by Douglas M. Stokes

[Back to Top](#)

Reviews of Popular Books
Open Windows: The Autobiography of Charlotte Troutwine-Braun
by Charlotte Troutwine-Braun
reviewed by Dianne Arcangel

[Back to Top](#)

<http://www.aspr.com/limits.htm>
118 captures
07 Apr 2001 - 17 Nov 2025
Jul AUG Sep
30
2013 2014 2015

[About this capture](#)

An Article from the Journal of
the American Society for Psychical Research

VOLUME 70
OCTOBER, 1976
NUMBER 4

The Limits of Experimenter Influence on Psi Test Results: Can Any Be Set?

RHEA A. WHITE^{Footnote.1}

ABSTRACT: This is the second in a series of articles on the role of the experimenter and additional personnel (other than the subject) taking part in parapsychological experiments. It reviews the evidence for psi-mediated experimenter effects, or the communication of experimenter bias, when all normal (i.e., sense-based) channels of communication are eliminated. Experiments in two broad categories are reviewed: (a) nonintentional psi experiments in which the subjects are unaware of certain important aspects of the test situation, or may not even know that they are taking part in a psi test; and (b) experiments in which the experimenter deliberately tries to influence the results by means of his own PK or ESP. When significant results are obtained in the first category, they may be due either to telepathy from the experimenter and/or his associates (psi-mediated experimenter effects) or to clairvoyance of the testing situation on the part of the subject (psi-mediated experimental effects). Significant results in the second category suggest either a direct influence of the experimenter upon the subject's responses by means of PK or an indirect influence by means of ESP. It is concluded that in psi research it may not be possible to differentiate between the experimenter and his experiment, and, therefore, between psi-mediated experimenter and psi-mediated experimental effects.

INTRODUCTION

This is the second in a series of papers dealing with the influence of the experimenter (and participants other than the subject) on psi test results. In psychology an experimenter effect has been reported by several authors and there are a number of surveys on the topic (e.g., Barber, 1973; Barber and Silver, 1968; Jung, 1971; Kintz, Delprato, Mettee, Persons, and Shappe, 1965; Rosenthal, 1966).

The experimenter effect in psychology has been described as the response of subjects to the needs and wishes of the experimenter or to factors in the experimental situation other than those to which the experimenter has overtly instructed them to respond. The explanation for experimenter effects in psychology experiments assumes that they are sense-mediated: that the subject is guided by subtle sensory cues-sometimes received subliminally-which are unintentionally provided by the experimenter. Another paper in this series (White, in press) attempts to show that these same factors are also associated with experimenter effects in parapsychology. But the results of a number of parapsychological experiments have suggested that experimenter effects may also be psi-mediated; that is, the subject may respond to the wishes and needs of the experimenter over and beyond what he is told by the experimenter and under conditions which rule out the possibility of sense-mediation. In such cases, the only way the subject could obtain the relevant information would be from the experimenter by means of telepathy (i.e., a psi-mediated experimenter effect), or by clairvoyance of the testing situation (i.e., a psi-mediated experimental effect). Even if the latter is the case, it is difficult to see how the experimental situation can be separated from the experimenter, for in a sense it can be viewed as a trap which the experimenter has devised with the intention of catching a particular finding which will fulfill his hopes and expectations.

Moreover, as I have tried to show in the first paper (White, 1976) in this series, in some instances it does not appear to be the experimenter himself who influences the subject's scores, but rather some other participant in the test situation, whether it be an observer, agent, randomizer, checker, or data collector. Although most of these "other participant" effects are no doubt due to subtle sensory cues or psychological influences in the testing situation, here too the effects may be psi-mediated. Therefore the term "psi-mediated experimenter effect" is used in this paper in its broadest sense, i.e., to indicate the effect not only of the experimenter, but also that of anyone assisting him in carrying out tasks relevant to the experiment or otherwise participating in it.

Another point to be made in this paper is that the results of psi experiments may be contaminated by psi itself. When psi-mediated experimenter effects occur, it is sometimes difficult to determine whose psi is responsible for them: that of the subject, the experimenter, the other research personnel, or that of all of these. However, it seems likely that such effects are most often connected with the person who is more interested in the results than anyone else even the subject—namely, the primary experimenter. Moreover, since the primary experimenter^{Footnote.2} is responsible for reporting the results, we are provided with a fuller account of his viewpoint than that of the others involved and thus what we are presented with in assessing the findings is his account of the experiment. Although it may seem farfetched, it might be worthwhile in all research reports to present firsthand accounts of the experiments from all persons playing a significant role in them.

Although theoretically the results of all parapsychological experiments are susceptible to interpretation in terms of psi-mediated experimenter effects, the effect has thus far been isolated in only two major types of testing situation: those allowing for the expression of nonintentional psi (a psi response to material which the subject is not deliberately trying to apprehend), and those in which the experimenter deliberately tries to use psi to influence the subject's scores. Experiments of both types will be reviewed below. Some of them are discussed in one or both of the other papers in this series (White, 1976; in press); when they are described again here, it is to illustrate points not hitherto emphasized.

NONINTENTIONAL PSI EFFECTS

The first review of nonintentional ESP and PK effects was made by Stanford (1974a, 1974b). With regard to ESP (Stanford, 1974a), he classified these effects in three categories. The first is illustrated by those experiments (Carpenter, 1971; Johnson, 1971; Johnson and Nordbeck, 1972; Stanford, unpublished) in which, unknown to the subjects, the experimenter had included in some of the targets certain motivationally important material in order to observe its effects on the test results. Stanford's second category of nonintentional ESP effects derives from experiments "in which subjects apparently used nonintentional ESP to respond to the wishes, intentions, moods, etc., of the experimenter" (pp. 39-40). In this category he cites studies of Feather and Brier (1968), Fisk and West (1958), Osiris, Turner, and Carlson (1971), and West and Fisk

(1953). His third classification consists of experiments in which the subjects demonstrated ESP in a situation in which they did not even know that they were taking part in a test of ESP. He includes five experiments in this group: Johnson (1973), Kreitler and Kreitler (1972), Lewis and Schmeidler (1971), and Stanford (1970, 1973).

Stanford's classification of nonintentional psi is largely concerned with types of target material and motivational factors. In discussing the experiments he reviewed, and some additional ones, I will use a different scheme of classification. Since I am primarily concerned with presenting the evidence for psi-mediated experimenter effects, my classification will stress those aspects of the experiments in which the experimenter had no normal knowledge of the targets, or if he did, the experimental conditions were such that it was impossible for him to convey the information to the subject by sensory means. Hence in all five of the following categories of nonintentional psi any significant experimenter effects which were evidenced must have been psi-mediated.

The first category consists of research in which experimenter and subjects were separated by a considerable distance. In the second group are studies in which they were separated by a "time barrier" during crucial periods of the test. The third category, and by far the largest, consists of those experiments in which the subjects were either not aware that they were being tested for psi, or if aware of that, kept in ignorance of certain important aspects of the testing situation. (In all the experiments in this group the experimenter was present with the subjects and aware of the experimental objectives, but ignorant of the actual targets and thus unable to cue the subjects by normal means.) The fourth category consists of experiments in which neither the experimenter administering the test nor the subjects were aware of the main experimental objectives. The final group is made up of studies in which the subjects apparently picked up information relevant to the experiment which was unknown to and unanticipated by the experimenter during the running of the tests.

Experiments in Which Experimenter and Subjects Were Widely Separated by Distance

If it is admitted that there is an experimenter effect in para psychology, as there is in psychology (Rosenthal, 1966), then the common-sense assumption—given the current scientific paradigm—is that the causes of experimenter effects in parapsychology are the same as in psychology. In psychology they are attributed to the subject's reactions to personal characteristics of the experimenter, his method of handling the subject, and subtle unintentional cues such as tone of voice, posture, gestures, etc., which guide the subject to make the response the experimenter is hoping for. Since almost all psychology experiments are run in a testing situation in which subject and experimenter are in the same room, these are likely hypotheses to explain the fact that divergent results are often obtained by different experimenters. But in parapsychology subjects are often out of range of sensory cues from the experimenter—and still some experimenter effects sneak through! If these effects are not chance-determined, it is difficult to see how they could occur unless they are psi-mediated.

As far as I know, the first experiment providing clear-cut evidence of a psi-mediated

experimenter effect was carried out by West and Fisk (1953). They tested 20 subjects by mail, sending them 32 sealed packs of 12 clock cards, four packs at a time. Half the packs had been randomized and sealed by Fisk and half by West, but as far as the subjects knew, Fisk was the only experimenter involved. The overall results were significant ($P = .0011$), but only Fisk's data were independently significant ($P = .00015$) while those of West were at chance.^{Footnote.3} It is interesting to note that on the basis of earlier experiments, West had suggested that Fisk "seemed to belong to a group of successful experimenters while he himself [West] belonged to a group who could only achieve null results" (p. 185).

Soal and Bateman (1955) reported that in some of their experiments with the high-scoring subject, Basil Shackleton, in which conditions of target presentation were changed without telling him that this was the case, and when he and the experimenters were in a different room, his scoring level dropped.

Fisk and West (1958) conducted an experiment along the lines of their clock card experiment described above, but working with only one subject and using a PK test in which the PK target had to be selected by ESP. Fisk corresponded with the subject and she mailed him her score sheets. Unknown to her, however, Fisk and West alternated in displaying the target faces, neither knowing those of the other. As in the clock card experiment, there was a significant positive deviation on Fisk's targets ($P = .013$) while the score on West's targets was at chance. A chi-square test of the number of hits and misses on the targets of the two experimenters showed that the difference between their results was marginally significant ($P = .05$).

Marsh (1959) carried out a GESP experiment in which 371 college students tried to reproduce pictures drawn by an agent 470 miles away. The aspect of Marsh's experiment that is relevant to psi-mediated experimenter effects is the way in which he used linkage material associated with the agent. The subjects were divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group, and were told that they would have different agents. (The control group did not know that it had been so designated, and in actual fact there was only one agent, not two.) In a summary review of the experiment, Fisk (1960) describes the situation as follows: "Both groups were given precisely similar instructions but whereas the Experimental Group was given correct linkage material that given to the Control Group was incorrect. No linkage material was provided for the first five-day section in order that this section might provide an indication of the normal scoring level of the two groups when no linkage was operating..." (p. 224).

The types of linkage materials used were colored squares possessed in common by agent and subjects, squares from the agent's handkerchiefs, photographs and personality test results of the agent, and an intimate autobiography of the agent. In each instance the Experimental Group was given correct linkage material while the Control Group was given fabricated linkage material.

There was a significant difference in scoring between the Experimental and Control Groups, as measured by chi square. The Experimental Group scored above chance

while the Control Group scored below chance to a similar degree (perhaps indicating that by means of ESP they knew they weren't getting the real McCoy and didn't like it!). In the first five-day section when no linkage material was used the difference between the scores of the two groups was not significant. However, significant improvements in scoring were made by the Experimental Group when they received a photograph and personality description of the agent, while no such scoring increment was obtained by the Control Group. The handkerchief squares provided the Experimental Group also were associated with significantly improved scores for the Experimental Group, but not for the Control. The colored squares did not improve the scores of either group.

The fact that consciously the subjects thought they had two different agents and both groups thought of themselves as experimental, not knowing that one of them had been designated a control group nor that both groups shared the same agent, combined with the fact that the two groups scored significantly in opposite directions, points to the operation of a psi-mediated experimenter effect. The linkage material, which all subjects assumed to be correct, further accentuated the scoring differences.

Osis and Carlson (1972) carried out three clairvoyance distance experiments in which the targets were displayed in their laboratory while the subjects worked at home. Both experimenters sat beside the targets, which were arranged on the floor. The subjects were asked to focus their attention on Osis, who was well known to them, and they were not informed of the presence of Carlson. Both experimenters rated their moods during each session. The ESP scores were found to be correlated only with the mood of the unknown experimenter. This finding was confirmed in the third experiment in which Osis was unable to come to the laboratory and so sat with the targets at home while Carlson sat with them in the laboratory as usual. The total deviation from chance in this experiment was suggestive and again the correlations indicated that the subjects were responding only to Carlson's mood.

Experiments in Which Experimenter and Subjects Were Separated by a "Time Barrier"

As would be expected in the emerging paradigm to which the data of parapsychology point, but in flagrant contradiction to the current scientific world view of what can happen, it would appear that not only can experimenter effects occur when the subject is spatially separated from the experimenter, but also when a time barrier separates them during probably the two most crucial points of any ESP experiment: the time when the subjects make their calls and the time when the experimenter determines the target order and checks the results.

An excellent illustration of the penetrability of the time barrier is an experiment of Schmeidler's (1964a) in which 75 subjects made 150 calls for targets which would later be selected by a computer. It was planned that later the subjects would be shown a third of their calls and their associated targets, another third would be seen only by the experimenter, and the last third would never be printed out, but would simply be scored by computer. The subjects were not informed of this aspect of the experiment. While the subjects were making their calls the experimenter was ignorant of which calls would fall

in which of the three treatment categories. Schmeidler (1964b) found a significant negative correlation between those calls only the experimenter saw scored and those the subjects saw ($P = .00015$). Schmeidler suggests that "this correlation implied that the subjects had been responding to the difference between conditions; a difference that did not yet exist but would be produced by the letters [by means of which the subjects were notified of their scores]" (p. 24).

In this experiment the subjects once again were able to respond differentially to different conditions even though they had not even been told that they existed. And since the treatment to be given each call had not been determined at the time the subjects made their responses, they had no contemporaneous means of obtaining the information and thus must have used either precognitive clairvoyance or a combination of precognitive clairvoyance and telepathy to do so.

Another series of experiments indicating that subjects can use psi to distinguish between experimental conditions that have not yet been determined was reported by Feather and Brier (1968). The subjects were told that the experimenter would check half their runs (to be determined randomly) while someone else (known to the experimenter but not to the subjects) would check the other half. Subjects were also requested to specify those runs they felt the known experimenter would later check. In two pilots with Feather as the known checker and Brier as the unknown checker, the subjects obtained a differential effect, but only on those runs checked by Feather. When they thought she would check the runs and she actually did, they scored above chance, whereas when they thought the other person would check the scores but Feather actually did, they scored below chance. For the two pilots combined the difference was significant ($P < .03$, two-tailed). In a confirmatory experiment Brier was the known checker whereas Feather was the unknown checker. The differential effect again occurred on the runs checked by Brier, but not on those checked by Feather ($P < .02$, one-tailed). Since the checker or experimenter effect noted in these data was apparently not due simply to the subjects' conscious expectations of who would check the runs but was based on who actually did check them, the effect had to be psi-mediated, in this case by precognition.

Stanford has pioneered in testing nonintentional psi. His first experiment of this type was one of precognition (Stanford, 1970). Thirty male college students were tested individually for what they assumed was their ability to remember details of a taped dream report. The test consisted of a four-choice multiple-choice test. The memory questionnaires were scored several weeks later by an assistant who did not compare the answers with the actual dream report. Instead, she used a random number table to select on a one-fourth probability basis as correct for each item one of the four possible choices. Thus the ESP task was a precognitive one. In a later discussion of the results of this experiment, Stanford (1974) wrote:

Subjects were strongly biased to give the answer supplied on the tape. However, the effect of nonintentional ESP was sufficiently strong to overcome this bias in some instances. [Which one could say is equivalent to saying that two and two make five!] The following comparison makes the point clearly: On trials in which the random

process selected as correct the answer subjects had actually heard on the tape, subjects produced responses contradicting the tape only 1.96% of the time; on trials in which the random process selected as correct an answer contradictory to what subjects had heard on the tape, they produced responses contradicting the tape 16.40% of the time. The difference of proportions is significant. On the trials in which subjects thus made responses counter to a strong bias engendered by having heard the tape they were accurate 46.90% of the time when by mean chance expectation 25.00% accuracy is expected, a result which is highly significant (pp. 41-42).

Thus in this experiment the subjects had to use two kinds of psi to discern two different aspects of the experiment: they had to use precognition to significantly "remember" the random responses and they had to use a form of contemporaneous ESP to be able to respond to the nonintentional ESP task to begin with! (There is also a possibility that they performed the latter task by precognitive clairvoyance, but telepathy from the experimenter or his assistants cannot be ruled out.)

The last experiment in this group was carried out by Johnson (1971), who administered a group precognition test to a class of 28 adult students. They did two runs of 25 calls of the numbers one through five. However, unknown to them, there was also an unconscious aspect to this experiment involving what Johnson called "secondary targets." He had asked the subjects at the time they made their calls to note four words on their sheets: all four were to be of a very personal and intimate nature, and two were to have very pleasant associations for the subject while two were to have very unpleasant associations. The subjects were not informed as to how these words would be used in the experiment. Using an ABBA order, Johnson later associated 10 of the targets in each run with "pleasant" words for each subject and 10 targets were associated with the "unpleasant" words. Five targets in each run served as a control and had no secondary word associations. The subjects scored positively (but not significantly) on the targets with positive associations; they obtained a significant negative score on the targets with negative associations ($P = .0094$, one-tailed); and they scored at chance on the targets not associated with any secondary targets. The difference in scoring on the "pleasant" and "unpleasant" secondary targets was significant ($P = .005$, one-tailed). Thus, even though the subjects did not know that certain targets would later be associated with words they had designated as "pleasant" or "unpleasant," and even though at the time they made their calls the order of neither the primary (number) or secondary (word) targets had been determined, they responded in a manner which was in line with the experimental expectations.

Experimenter-Present Experiments with Subjects Either Unaware of Being Tested for Psi or Ignorant of Important Aspects of the Test, and with Targets Unknown to Experimenter

In the experiments in this category the experimenter was with the subjects during the testing and aware of the experimental objectives; in all cases, however, the actual targets were unknown to him and therefore he could not have cued the subjects by normal means.

One of the first studies of this type was conducted by Woodruff (1960). He included in

the target order a number of ESP symbols which had been stamped in red ink, whereas the subjects proceeded on the assumption that all symbols were stamped in black ink. In Part I of the experiment only black symbols were used in order to provide a control for Part II in which symbols of both colors were employed. There was a higher average score in Part II on the red targets as opposed to the score on the black targets, but the difference was not significant. However, there was a significantly greater fluctuation around the theoretical mean in the scores of the subjects responding to the red symbols than in those responding to the black symbols ($P = .01$).

In two exploratory experiments Carpenter (1971) administered a blind matching ESP test using ESP symbols. Unknown to the subjects, each envelope containing an ESP card also contained another card. Half of the time the additional card was an erotic picture and half the time it was a blank card. The subjects in the first experiment were 19 junior high school students. All were sheep. They were also administered the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. A significant interaction ($P < .01$) was found between the two types of targets and the degree of anxiety manifested: the high anxiety subjects scored positively on the neutral targets but below chance on the erotic targets while the subjects in the mid and low range on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale reversed the pattern.

The subjects in the second experiment were 31 male college freshmen, and the Mosher Guilt Scale was used to assess sex guilt. The sheep-goat effect was also measured. There were 16 sheep and they scored significantly higher on the erotic targets than on the neutral targets. The 15 goats did not produce a significant scoring differentiation on the two types of targets, but "the high-guilt goats scored higher on the erotic targets than on the neutral ones, while the low-guilt goats scored higher on the neutral targets than on the erotic ones" (p. 212).

In an unpublished experiment which Stanford describes in a later paper (Stanford, 1974a), he confirmed Carpenter's results using verbal erotic stimuli rather than erotic pictures. Whereas Carpenter had worked only with male subjects, Stanford also included females in his study, but he was only able to confirm Carpenter's effect with his male subjects.

Lewis and Schmeidler (1971) were the first to use the term "nonintentional ESP." It was in connection with an experiment in which there were two sessions in which 14 subjects tried to control their alpha and to identify its presence by means of a key press. Unknown to the subjects, the key press also registered an ESP call. There followed a half-hour period during which the subjects received alpha training with feedback. In the third and fourth sessions, the subjects made purposeful ESP calls using the key press. The half-hour training session was used to provide feedback concerning their ESP hits.

There was no evidence of either alpha or ESP learning. In the first two sessions, on the nonintentional ESP calls, the subjects obtained significant positive scores when they were generating more alpha and their scores were at the chance level when they were generating less alpha. In the purposeful ESP sessions, the ESP scores were

significantly positive when less alpha was generated or was absent, but when the subjects generated more alpha their scores were at chance. Thus the result of the ESP tests in the last two sessions is a mirror image of the result in the first two sessions. The important aspect of these results as far as the present paper is concerned is the fact that the subjects did as well on the ESP test which they didn't even know they were taking as they did on the purposeful ESP tests.

Schouten (1971) carried out an experiment to see if subjects would score differently on non-coded targets (photographs of target objects) than on coded targets (words symbolizing the target objects). In order to eliminate target preferences, the subjects were not informed about the use of coded targets. As far as they knew, they were responding to non-coded targets. Actually, half of the targets were coded and half were non-coded. There were 24 subjects and they were given cards representing the non-coded targets. They were asked to match the envelopes containing the targets with these five cards. Even though the subjects did not know about the coded targets, they scored significantly in a negative direction on them ($P = .02$) while they scored at chance on the non-coded targets of which they were aware.

Johnson and Nordbeck (1972) reported on work with a subject who had had several spontaneous ESP experiences and had evidenced scoring fluctuations above and below chance in laboratory tests. She was also subject to spells of anxiety. After examining clinical material and personality test data, Johnson chose six words, half on pleasant themes in the subject's life and half representing unpleasant themes. Five each of the six words were written on cards, wrapped in foil, and sealed in opaque envelopes. Another batch of six each served as target objects and were similarly sealed. The subject was not informed of the nature of the target stimuli but was simply asked to perform a blind matching test by placing the 30 sealed cards in piles of five each on the six target envelopes "according to her impression of 'similarities' " (p. 126). During the test the target envelopes were in a room on a different floor and were displayed to the subject by means of closed-circuit TV. It was predicted that she would score positively on the pleasant targets and negatively on the unpleasant ones. Three runs of 30 calls each were done under these conditions and a fourth "in which both the target cards and matching cards were replaced by strips of magnetic recording tape onto which the spoken target words previously had been recorded" (p. 127). Where chance is 10 for each type of target, she scored only two hits on the negative targets and 19 on the positive. The difference was significant ($P < .01$, two-tailed). (The same scoring tendency was maintained on the last run where the targets were strips of magnetic tape!)

A repetition was planned, but in the interim Johnson held a seminar on parapsychology in which he described what he had done in this experiment. To his surprise and chagrin, the subject was present. She was displeased that private material had been used as targets and was reluctant to participate. She did do three runs, however, and the scores were in the predicted direction, though not significant. In any case, this second experiment did not involve nonintentional ESP since the subject was then aware of the target differentiation.

Two subgroups of experiments relevant to nonintentional psi and psi-mediated experimenter effects will be reviewed next.

1. ESP Experiments Disguised as Academic Examinations

Johnson (1973) conducted three clairvoyance experiments (two pilots and one confirmatory) with college students who took an eight-question psychology examination. The examination answer sheets were attached to the front and back of a large envelope. Unknown to the subjects, inside the envelope were typed the answers to four of the questions (selected randomly). The subjects were not aware that there was an ESP aspect to the examination.

In the first two experiments the hypothesis was that the scores would be higher on the target questions (those with the concealed answers) than on the non-target questions (those without answers). In both experiments the subjects got higher scores on the target questions than on the non-target questions and the differences were significant ($P = .022$; $P = .045$).

In the third experiment an attempt was made to elicit psi-missing by using both "primary" and "secondary" targets. The primary targets, which had a negative function, consisted of concealed information which was relevant to the exam questions, but incorrect. The secondary targets contained no information relevant to the exam and consisted of typed sentences aimed at either encouraging or discouraging the subjects. Positive secondary targets (e.g., "You will certainly pass this exam") were used in association with non-target questions. Negative secondary targets (e.g., "You are too stupid to pass this exam") were paired with primary targets in order to reinforce negative scoring on those targets. The results gave significant support ($P = .005$) to the hypothesis that "scores on the questions provided with incorrect answers and negative psychological reinforcement would be lower than scores on answers to nontarget questions, which were provided with positive psychological reinforcement" (p. 210).

Willis, Duncan, and Udofia (1974) attempted a replication of Johnson's (1973) work. Two introductory psychology classes took a midterm examination consisting of a 35-item multiple-choice test. In the first class 100 students received exam sheets with the answers to the first six questions enclosed in a test envelope while 104 students did not. The difference in the mean number of errors for the two groups was not significant. In the second class 70 students received tests with answers to the first six questions enclosed while 77 did not. Again, the difference in the results for the two groups was nonsignificant. The authors summarize by saying that "the rate of errors on the first page [containing six items] was not significantly different from the rate on the remainder of the test in either class" (p. 582).

Although this was a conceptual replication of Johnson's (1973) work, it was far from an exact one. By using the first six items in the multiple-choice test as the ESP targets instead of randomizing them throughout the entire test, the experimenters made

themselves vulnerable to various extraneous factors. For example, the actual questions asked on the first page may have been either easier or harder to get right by normal means than the questions on the remainder of the test. Perhaps the subjects had not "warmed up" to the test conditions on the first few questions and so ESP had less chance of operating. There may also have been distractions during the first part of the test due to rustling of papers or the arrival of late students. Certainly the stacking effect cannot be ruled out. And whereas half of Johnson's questions had concealed answers and the responses to these were compared with the answers on the half that had no concealed answers, in the experiment of Willis and associates the ratio of targets to non-targets was 6 to 29.

Braud (1975) also attempted a replication of Johnson (1973). He used 46 subjects who were members of an undergraduate parapsychology course. The results of 22 subjects were considered to constitute a pilot experiment and those of 24 subjects as a confirmatory experiment. In addition to testing nonintentional ESP in the context of an academic examination, Braud measured the subjects' psi performance in relation to their need for "test-relevant information." A conscious clairvoyance task was also involved.

The examination was made up of three parts. The first part contained 16 items testing knowledge of parapsychological terms, and Part 2 was made up of 14 items concerning methodological procedures. Part 3 was the conscious clairvoyance task which consisted of 24 four-choice alternative items on a sheet stapled to the outside of a manila envelope within which were the "correct" answers. The students were informed that the results on this task would count toward their final grades; what they did not know was that the envelope also contained the targets for an unconscious clairvoyance test. The targets for this test consisted of the correct answers to seven of the 14 items in Part 2 of the exam.

In the pilot experiment the scores of the conscious clairvoyance task were at a chance level. The results of the unconscious clairvoyance task, however, were extrachance as evidenced by the fact that there were significantly fewer errors in Part 2 on the items for which answers were supplied than on the items for which no answers were supplied ($P = .025$, one-tailed).

Similar results were obtained in the confirmatory experiment: chance results on the conscious clairvoyance task and significant results on the unconscious clairvoyance task ($P = .025$, one-tailed). When the data of both experiments are combined, the results on the nonintentional ESP task are highly significant ($P = .0016$, onetailed).

Part I of the exam, in which no answers were supplied, provided a baseline for assessing the subjects' normal knowledge of the course content. Braud reports a Spearman rank-order correlation calculated for the subjects' unconscious clairvoyance scores versus their total error scores on Parts 1 and 2 where they could have scored well simply through normal knowledge of the answers. The correlation was significant ($P < .01$, two-tailed), indicating that "there was a significant tendency for poor grades on